

THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

NO. XLVI....JUNE, 1847.

ARTICLE I.

"PERFECT IN ONE."

1. *Appeal to the American Churches, with a Plan for Catholic Union.* By S. S. SCHMUCKER, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod of the Lutheran Church, Gettysburg, Pa.
2. *Historical Sketch of the Evangelical Alliance.* By REV. DAVID KING, L. L. D.
3. *Articles on "Christian Unity" and "Christian Union,"* in the New Englander, Vol. IV.

The union of Christians! The unity of the universal church! There is something in the words, which, as we write them, warms the blood in our veins, and wakens visions enrapturing to the believer's heart. They carry us back to the apostolic age of the church, her "sweet hour of prime," when she inhaled the morning breath of the gospel day, and, however foes might rage without, all within was harmony and peace. They carry us forward to the time when the whole assembly and church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven, shall be gathered around the throne of God and the Lamb; and there, amid the blaze of celestial glory, the fulness of immortal joy, the gushing transports of perfect love, shall

lose all remembrance of the petty feuds that now divide them, while from the vast unbroken throng of happy spirits shall continually ascend the strains of that "new song"—forever singing, yet forever new: "THOU art worthy; for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation,"—and not one harsh discordant note be ever heard to impede the current of the immortal theme. They call up too a conception of the church universal on earth, on which, though existing as yet, alas! in conception only, the Christian heart will dwell with never-tiring delight; and to the realization of which, Christian hope clings, as the promised consummation of the Redeemer's work, the finished demonstration of his power to save. That vision filled his soul, when in the last words of his last recorded prayer, leaving the wants of his immediate disciples, his mind ran down along the track of coming ages, and expanded with the spreading triumphs of his kingdom, and he prayed, "not for these alone, but for them also which shall believe through their word. That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may know that thou hast sent me. The glory which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be one even as we are one, I in them and thou in me: that they may be made PERFECT IN ONE, and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me." Wonderful prayer! where has been the spiritual discernment of the Church, that she has so long overlooked its profound and pregnant significance? Blessed prayer! suggesting at once to the attentive mind, and beyond all the power of logical discussion, the true divine ideal of the Christian society on earth, the most urgent and affecting plea for the restoration of its perfect unity, and an implicit pledge that the world shall yet see and acknowledge this irresistible evidence of the divine mission and all-conquering love of our Lord.

Until very lately, however, nothing has appeared in the signs of the times to indicate the near approach of this consummation so devoutly to be wished. The only distinct, unfaltering witness for a catholic unity of the church, was Rome; and her testimony on this, as on all

other subjects, was so monstrous and palpable a lie, that multitudes of spiritual minds were driven to the opposite extreme, and the idea became at length a very popular one, that the sectarian form which Christianity has assumed in these last days, is really a matter of congratulation to the church and of thanksgiving to God! Of course, the war of sects went on; and even in their efforts to promote the truth which, for substance, they held in common, the churches of Protestantism proceeded on as distinct, dissimilar, often hostile and mutually destructive plans, as though they were serving rival masters and had opposing interests to consult. An unbelieving world looked on and mocked. It was in 1815, we think, that an eloquent writer of our own denomination depicted, in the following language, this melancholy state of things.

"Though this rending of the seamless garment of our Saviour, this schism in the members of his mystical body, is by far the greatest calamity which has befallen the Christian interest, and one of the most fatal effects of the great apostacy foretold by the sacred penmen, we have been so long familiarized to it as to be scarcely sensible of its enormity; nor does it excite surprise or concern, in any degree proportioned to what would be felt by one who had contemplated the church in the first ages. Christian societies regarding each other with the jealousies of rival empires, each aiming to raise itself on the ruin of all others, making extravagant boasts of superior purity, generally in exact proportion to their departure from it, and scarcely deigning to acknowledge the possibility of obtaining salvation out of their pale, is the odious and disgusting spectacle which modern Christianity presents. The evils which result from this state of division are incalculable: it supplies infidels with their most plausible topics of invective; it hardens the consciences of the irreligious, weakens the hands of the good, impedes the efficacy of prayer, and is probably the principal obstruction to that ample effusion of the Spirit which is essential to the renovation of the world." Hall's Works, Vol. I, p. 289. (Harpers' edition.)

Thirty years have passed since this good man proposed *his* remedy for the evil, and this is still a faithful portraiture of the existing state of things; though we cannot but hope that the state of feeling in regard to it, is beginning to be changed. The time is past, we trust forever, when it could with truth be said of the Christian world, that they are "insensible of its enormity;" that "it does not excite surprise or concern;" or that nothing is doing for its removal, and for the restoration of that universal

fellowship, that free fraternal intercourse and coöperation, which distinguished the Christian community in the first ages. Within the past few years, there has been an almost simultaneous, and, in many respects, a very remarkable waking up in all parts of spiritual Christendom to the claims of this subject; and our readers are familiar with the progress of an interesting experiment, recently commenced on an imposing scale for the purpose of giving this impulse a practical direction; an experiment, which, whatever may be its immediate results, can hardly fail to render the year 1846 memorable, as the opening of a new era in the history of spiritual Christianity.

We refer of course to the organization of the *Evangelical Alliance*, at London, in the month of August last. That organization we are constrained to regard as the form in which a deep, pervading and powerful feeling, long at work in the very heart of the church and now forcing its way outward thence, has been providentially led to embody and express itself. Individuals there may have been, parties, and, for aught we know, entire sects, who united in this movement and were even active in setting it on foot, as has been asserted, from the suggestions of a selfish policy, and with a notion that they might turn it to account in the furtherance of sectarian ends. But it would be idle to suppose that an element of this kind entered to any formidable extent into the ultimate composition of the Alliance. The success of such schemers, if with such the measure originated, has been to call up a spirit which will neither act at their dictation nor down at their bidding—a spirit which, instead of working in blear-eyed subservience to sectarian designs, has grasped the very pillars of sectarianism, and will do what it can to prostrate the whole fabric with its supporters.

We have, then, no fears that this organization will become the tool of a party. It has too many edges, cutting too many ways, to be safely handled for such a purpose. It is watched by too many vigilant eyes; it has spread itself too far, having already incorporated into its constituency members of numerous and widely separated religious sects, citizens of many countries, even the inhabitants of different continents; above all, it is animated by a spirit too genuine and pure, too definite in its aims and too determined in its manifestations, to warrant any

remaining fear that its influence, be that more or less, will be other than antagonistic to the present organization at least of sectarian Christianity. Its testimony will be against the spirit, if not against the fact of sect; and though it should never again be convened, its testimony will not be wholly in vain. Whether it is destined to survive or to perish, to act with increasing energy in the life and form of Christianity in the times to come, or to pass away in a transient burst of generous feeling; whether, on the former supposition, its success will be the triumphant restoration of the true church catholic, or a mere re-organization of the church sectarian, and the introduction of some subtler device, of human or of diabolic invention, to mock the hopes of the Christian, and embarrass the progress of the truth: this, in our judgment, will depend almost entirely, under God, on the degree of practical respect paid to the word of God in the detailed development of its plan, and the future conduct of its operations. If it be of God, it will stand; and so far as its action accords with his revealed will, and no farther, will its influence be benignant and lasting.

But it is time for us to take a nearer view of the plans which are proposed for the promotion of this sacred cause, and to determine, if possible, the leading principles which should guide our conduct in respect to it.

The earliest distinct expression that we remember to have seen, of this ardent desire for Christian union, was the admirable paper from the pen of Rev. Dr. Schmucker, published in the *Biblical Repository* for January and April, 1838; and since republished in two or three successive editions of the little volume, whose title we have placed at the head of our article. It should be read by all who feel an interest in this subject, or who love to witness the manifestations of a pure and lofty spirit. The benevolent author takes higher ground than it was thought expedient for the Alliance to assume, and presses the obligation of Christian unity in a form which, in our judgment, comes much nearer the infallible standard of duty, though doubtless it is beyond all hope of immediate attainment in the existing state of the religious world. He urges, not merely the desirableness of a voluntary association among individual Christians, on some convenient plan, to manifest and promote the spirit of union,

but the absolute necessity and sacred obligation resting on the evangelical churches of Christ, to adopt some plan of visible fellowship, intercommunion, and coöperation, that will constitute a practical unity of the whole church; and he recognizes the apostolic model as an authoritative guide for all ages, as to the mode and form of that unity. In this view we wish to record our deliberate and cordial concurrence. It is unquestionably the true doctrine; and though for prudential reasons, it may be better to limit our first efforts to objects more immediately and certainly within our reach, yet we deem it of the last importance, that nothing short of this glorious end should be the goal at which we aim. We strike hands with all of every name, who make it an object of hope and prayer and effort. And it is mainly because we have feared that there was a disposition in some estimable and influential quarters to give countenance to a different doctrine, nay, openly and earnestly to teach that the affections of the Christian's heart and the demands of the Christian's Lord may be satisfied with something far short of this, and of a totally opposite nature, that we have been led to lift our pen on a subject whose general merits so many abler ones are discussing.

It is not difficult to detect the single flaw which vitiates and paralyzes the whole magnificent scheme of Dr. S., and renders impracticable the immediate restoration of primitive unity to the church. What were the essential elements of that unity? Presupposing the prevalence of that union of spirit which gave life to all external bonds, Dr. S. enumerates the following, as the outward means of manifesting and perpetuating it:

1. Unity of name. 2. Unity of opinion on fundamental doctrines. 3. Mutual acknowledgment of each other's acts of discipline. 4. Sacramental and ministerial communion. 5. Occasional epistolary communication. 6. Occasional consultation by delegates in an advisory council. An admirable enumeration, in the main; but rendered valueless, as a basis of catholic union among the churches, by one fatal omission. It is this: Substantial agreement as to the TERMS OF ADMISSION, and the MUTUAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES of members. This, unquestionably, existed among the apostolic churches, and had much to do with their ecclesiastical unity. Insert it in the third place

of the catalogue, and all the subsequent particulars might be omitted, as resulting from it so naturally and necessarily that they do not need to be mentioned. Omit it, and all those particulars lack the essential element of moral propriety.

Here then we have the very root of sectarianism in the church of Christ. Let us not cover it up and try to keep it out of sight, but expose it, and examine it, and pray over it, and strive to devise some means to cut it off. Give to the churches these three things, a common name, indicative of their common union to the Lord and consequent union to each other; unity in the truth; and unity in the fundamental principles of their organization: and you make them "perfect in one." But the two first they have already. God in his providence has preserved their first, best name (Acts 11 : 26) from sectarian desecration; and as to their oneness of faith, it surely needed no assembly of good men in the year 1846, to ascertain or assert what the voice of all history so distinctly declare, and what the violence and virulence of sectarian strife has in one point of view only rendered the more marked and unmistakable. No! the real difficulty, and the whole difficulty, lies in the absence of the third requisite. Shrink from the truth as much as we may, extenuate the evil as adroitly as we may, the simple fact is this. The root of sectarianism, among true Christians, is *the existence of sects*; and the distinction of sects is a difference of *organization*. Is no one to blame for it? Is nothing to be done about it?

It is well understood that the Evangelical Alliance has not proposed any direct effort to remove this evil. It does not bear any distinct testimony against the existence of sects; it does not seek to unite the several denominations by any ecclesiastical bonds; it does not pledge its members to labor or to pray for any change in the outward organization of Christianity. It is simply a voluntary association of individual Christians, to manifest and promote the spiritual oneness of the Saviour's disciples, and to restrain, so far as possible in the existing state of things, the offensive developments of sectarian feeling. The following distinct expressions on these points are found among its published minutes:

"That the Alliance is not to be considered as an alliance of denominations, or branches of the church, but of *individual Christians*, each acting on his own responsibility."

"That the great object of the Alliance shall be, *to aid in manifesting*, as far as practicable, the unity *which exists* amongst the true disciples of Christ; to promote their union by fraternal and devotional intercourse; to discourage all envyings, strifes and divisions; to impress upon Christians a deeper sense of the great duty of obeying our Lord's command, to 'love one another;' and *to seek the full accomplishment of his prayer*: 'That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee; that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.'"

We think that this limitation is a judicious one. We believe, that as its sectarian organization is the chief practical hindrance to a perfect unity in the church, so there is a real obstacle to the removal of that hindrance in the disordered and discordant views of the churches on the whole subject; that a great intellectual work is yet to be performed in Christendom, before the attempt can be made with any prospect of success; and that, while the Alliance may be expected, under God, to do much towards preparing the way for that attempt, nothing could more effectually have impeded its formation or impaired its influence than to commit it to that object at the outset. We cannot sympathize with the glowing anticipations of some of our brethren in other denominations, of a perfect unity amid reigning diversity. We cannot learn to love these ugly partition walls, that cut up into narrow segments the ample fold of Christ. We shall never cease to deprecate and deplore them; nor to ask, *Who built them there? and why are they allowed to stay?* But if we cannot get rid of them, we will do what we can to lower them, so that if we may not heartily embrace our brethren, we may at least shake hands and interchange the kiss of peace, and tell them our conviction that in "that better land" there will be no such barriers to impede our intercourse and check the flow of love.

But can we not get rid of them? Must we adopt the opinion that "the full accomplishment of our Saviour's prayer," though to be "sought," is not to be expected? Or shall we go farther still, and from its conceded impracticability, infer that it cannot be necessary or even greatly desirable? Is it, in short, to be one point of agreement among us in forming this new alliance, that the restora-

tion of the apostolic unity is not so much as to be named among us as a thing worthy of the desires and anxieties, the prayers and efforts of the children of God? We trust not. We do not so understand the compact. If we rightly read the article quoted above, the Alliance recognizes a style and standard of unity higher than its own, and points onward to something involved in the Saviour's prayer, superior to "the unity which already exists," commending it as an object to be "sought" by itself and all its members. And yet we are not without apprehensions, that it will seem to some inconsistent with the spirit if not with the letter of this compact, to talk of any higher form of unity than the compact itself illustrates. It will not be without some fear of rebuke that we venture still to exhort our brethren of diverse names, in this as in other matters pertaining to the kingdom of God, to "forget the things which are behind, and to reach forth unto those which are before"—not only, in those things "whereto they have already attained to walk by the same rule, to mind the same thing,"* but also to pray earnestly, and confidently to expect, that "if in any thing they be otherwise minded, God will reveal even this unto them." Our apprehensions, we will "frankly and affectionately" say, are founded on the style in which the claims of the new movement are advocated by many estimable brethren, who, in their cordial commendation of the Alliance, feel it necessary to disparage every thing beside, to brand as "sectarian" every thing beyond it, and to represent its measures, not only as admirably adapted to the existing state of Christendom, (which they are,) and eminently healing in their tendency, (which we trust they will prove to be,) but as absolutely perfect, and exclusively wise, inclusively and conclusively all-sufficient for every purpose which any enlightened Christian could for a moment desire. Are we asked for examples? Consult the religious newspapers, the magazines and reviews *passim*; or listen to any one of a thousand eloquent addresses and sermons with which the land is ringing, on the themes, "Unity in Diversity," "Unity without Uniformity," "The Inward and Spiritual and not the Outward and Carnal," "Give us the Essence,

* New Englander, Vol. 4, p. 274.

and away with the Forms," etc., etc. A yet more powerful and pervading influence in favor of this sentiment, is exerted by certain popular religious authors, whose works are deservedly esteemed for the learning, genius and genuine piety which they exhibit, and to some of whom we may have occasion to refer more particularly in the course of this article. We have placed at its head, also, the titles of two articles in the *New Englander*, merely as specimens of this kind of thing which happened to be at hand, and not because any quantity of others might not be easily found quite as much to our purpose.

These productions generally exhibit, as might be inferred from their themes, both a positive and a negative side; the positive being a distinct, truthful, earnest, loving appeal in favor of the unity of the spirit, in which we feel that we can concur with all our heart and soul; and the negative being a tremendous castigation of "a popish zeal for forms,"* inflicted directly on Roman Catholics and high-church Episcopalians, with an occasional glancing stroke or sly side-cut at—certain other narrow-spirited sinners, whom the logic of the authors curiously includes in the same category of *formalist*, and "whose tendency in this country," we are told, "is more and more to exclusive sectarianism."† As might be expected, we can sympathize very heartily in the sentiments, if not always in the taste or temper, of so much of this negative part as is intended for the Romanists, of whatever name; beyond that, we have a sense of personal interest in the infliction, which may perhaps interfere with a distinct perception of its justice. We can only wonder under what sort of influence clear heads can be, when they so pertinaciously overlook the most fair and reasonable distinctions, and confound under one sweeping judgment things wide as the poles asunder. Take, for instance, the first of the two articles referred to in the *New Englander*. It is a review, from the pen, as we understand, of a highly respectable Congregational minister in the city of New York, of a sermon on *Christian Unity* by the eloquent and large-hearted Leonard Bacon, D. D., of New Haven. A few extracts from both will illustrate our meaning. The italics we give as we find them.

* *New Englander*, vol. 4, p. 137.† *Ibid*, p. 135.

From the Review.—"What we want is the unity of fact, not of theory; *unity* not *uniformity*. The Liverpool Conference [preparatory to the formation of the Alliance] was of course discountenanced by Episcopalians generally; and we learn from private sources, that the Baptists were with difficulty prevailed upon to coöperate in the movement. It would be still more difficult to bring the Baptists of this country into such a plan of union. * * * We have no wish for uniformity. It is not essential to unity. Nay, it has often been its hindrance and its scourge. * * * By confounding unity with uniformity, we often overlook the legitimate and natural manifestations of unity. The unity of the followers of Christ does not consist in conformity to external laws; it is essentially 'a living and spiritual unity, &c.' * * * The moral aspects of the times indicate that there is to be a mighty conflict between spirituality and formalism, between freedom and despotism, between the unity of mutual confidence and love, and the unity of outward organization. Where there is the most of spirituality, there is also the most of Christian liberty. Where on the other hand unity is made to consist in mere uniformity, there is a formalism and often spiritual despotism. Yet men are continually deceived by this false name and show of unity."

From the Sermon.—One of the greatest hindrances to the advancement of Christian unity is "*a popish zeal for uniformity, as if that were unity.*" * * * The popery that may be found diffused like leaven in various Protestant communities—even among us—is more to be dreaded, and does more mischief, in respect to the development of Christian unity, than all the popery there is at Rome." * * * The manifestations of true Christian unity, "must be, in the nature of the case, spontaneous and vital, not coerced and formal. * * * Uniformity is not unity; nor is it of course evidence of unity. Uniformity imposed by the coercion of the state, or by the power of sectarian arrangements and corporations, or by the domination of a spiritual despotism, and submitted to in sluggishness or cowardice, or in the spirit of formalism, is as far from being a manifestation or resemblance of Christian unity, as artificial leaves and buds, fastened upon wire with threads and paste, are from being a manifestation or resemblance of that unseen vital power which, in the living plant, working by processes of its own, puts forth the green and growing stem, spreads out from within the delicately folded leaves, and opens the bud into the flower to show its beauty in the light and to shed its incense on the air."

When the term is qualified, as in the last sentence of each of the above extracts, and the point of the censure is directed against "*mere uniformity,*" i. e. uniformity destitute of the vital spirit of union, or "*uniformity imposed*" by any kind of coercion or human authority; or when it is defined, as in another place, as meaning a consolidated unity of organization, like that of the Romish church, we have not a word to say in opposition. Our whole judgment and heart unite in the denunciation. But we

beg leave to suggest both to the preacher and the reviewer, that their language of disparagement and reproach, unqualified as for the most part it is, is equally applicable to the "uniformity," which, we presume neither of them would deny, characterized the churches of the apostolic age.* Whether the continuance of that original uniformity be obligatory or not; whether it be desirable or not; whether it be practicable or not,—these are fair questions for discussion in the church, and about which Christians may honestly enough differ; not, however, according to our way of thinking, without at least one party's being in the wrong. But we respectfully submit, whether those who in simple honesty believe that it is obligatory, and of course desirable and practicable because it is apostolic and scriptural, must for that conviction be esteemed "sinners above all others" in Protestant Christendom, whose peculiar boast we had fondly thought it was to claim the Bible as the only and an all-sufficient guide in matters of religion. However that may be, such is in fact our conviction; and such we suppose to be the general opinion of Baptists, not only in this country, but even in England, where we are told "the tendency of the denomination is towards liberality."†

* We would not be sticklers for a word; yet we cannot refrain from a remark *en passant* on the unfortunate selection of terms in this motto, "Unity without uniformity;" intended by its inventors to be a precise expression of their position. Let it be observed that the question relates not to the creation of spiritual unity—for that, as the preacher elaborately shows, already exists—but to the outward manifestation of it. Now their creed is, Union among the churches without either unity or uniformity. Rome and her children contend for unity in the strict and proper sense of that term; which of course excludes the idea of union or uniformity; while we are willing to be known as the humble advocates of uniformity, and if we are asked for a definition this is our answer—universal conformity to the one apostolic model. Or, to do ourselves full justice, if we must have a motto, let it be this: "Uniformity and union among the churches, producing a scriptural unity of the church, and perfectly manifesting the spiritual unity of Christians."

This erroneous use of terms becomes more clear in the illustration, which with consistent infelicity, Dr. B. selects to explain his motto. "One and indivisible," says he, "was the motto of a republic without liberty—a republic of atheism and massacre. *E pluribus unum*, is the motto of that great expanding union which spreads its protection over our freedom." Now it is very obvious to remark, that the republic of France is, according to its motto, not a uniformity, but a unity; ours, not a unity, but a union, as the Dr. himself calls it in the very sentence, and be it observed, a union of uniform parts. What would Dr. B. think of a "republic," composed of confederated monarchies, oligarchies and democracies? It certainly would be a poor specimen of unity, and we fear, for lack of uniformity, would not long remain a union. This argument, therefore, such as it is, we claim.

† N. E., vol. 4, p. 135.

We shall be expected to assign some reasons for this conviction, and according to our ability, proceed to do so. If Christian unity is to become a definite object of united prayer and effort, it is surely worth while to inquire what is the true end to be sought? We contend, that it is nothing short of a perfect oneness of the church according to the Scriptural model; a restoration, in other words, of its outward and visible unity, as well as that inward and spiritual unity of which the former is the only suitable and sufficient manifestation. On the one extreme lies "the visible unity" of Rome, a huge, consolidated, soulless system, a mere formal organization, destitute of the principle of spiritual vitality and unadapted to its manifestation, worked through a round of automatic imitations of life, by means of a complicated mechanical apparatus under the control of its earthly head; a system which, by common consent, is not to be found in the Scriptures. Of course we are no advocates for that. We are as decidedly, if not as earnestly, opposed to that other idea, with which our estimable modern *πνευματικοί* are so much carried away, of a certain unity of spirit, wholly supersensuous and free from the carnalities of form, which is to triumph gloriously over all diversities of outward organization—not by any means in the sense of breaking down and removing them—but in the nobler and more Christian sense of showing, that, while we all cling to them with unwavering tenacity, they have no power to divide us in heart. The idea is in a great measure inconsistent and illusory; and the hope of realizing it is unwarranted both by reason and Scripture. A unity of this kind, even if practicable, would be essentially defective and weak. It would not come up to the scriptural standard; it would give an inadequate expression of the unity of spirit which really exists among the true followers of Christ; it could not reasonably be expected to hold itself together; and it would never make that moral impression on the world which rendered the oneness of his people an object of such profound interest to the Saviour's heart. These are some of the principal reasons on which our conviction rests. They will bear, perhaps, a little expansion; but as we have already occupied so much space, and there is a good deal that needs to be said on each head, we shall limit ourselves for the present to the first.

First, then, we say that a merely spiritual and invisible unity of the church will not answer the requirements of its Divine head, as made known in the Scriptures. This is our main objection. Remove this—let it be shown that it is consistent with our Lord's plan to have his people separated into "denominations" and sects, and we will forever after hold our peace. Our other objections grow out of what seem to us the nature and necessary tendencies of such a state of things. But our Lord is wiser than we. We will neither question where he distinctly approves, nor peremptorily condemn what he sees fit even to suffer. So long, however, as we believe that his plan requires an outward as well as an inward unity of the church, and seem to discover the wisdom of God in that arrangement, we cannot rest contented with any thing less.

But there are some who deny that any determinate form of church organization can be traced in the Scriptures; or, at least, any that is to be regarded as binding on the church in later times and under altered circumstances.* In the first shape, few scholars could be found hardy enough to avow this doctrine; the last assertion is frequently and boldly made. The Scriptures themselves furnish the best and completest refutation of both; but it suits not our present purpose (which is to avoid all expression of denominational views) to interrogate the sacred oracles on this subject. Nor is it necessary. The sentiments we think may be sufficiently refuted by an unfolding of their own implications.

Let it be first observed, that, on either of these suppositions, the Saviour is made responsible for all the evils which have resulted from the separation of his people into hostile sects; for, in either case, it is not only left wholly to the discretion of each church to determine its own organization, and frame its own regulations on the broadest ground of expediency; but also to that of every individual Christian, whether he will or will not continue

* So the learned and candid Mosheim seems to say, though with a faltering tongue. His section on this subject (Eccl. Hist. B. 1, part 2, ch. 2,) is a fine specimen of what might be called *logical oscillation*; and when he stops, it is hard to tell which way the pendulum is swinging. Dr. Maclaine, his English editor, echoes the sentiment in a foot-note, with better success. *Amen* does not "stick in his throat." As thus: "The truth is, that Christ, by leaving this matter undetermined, has left to Christian societies a discretionary power," etc.

subject to its government. Thus the doors are thrown wide open for changes and divisions interminable; first, in different countries and successive ages; for with every change of time and place the outward circumstances of the church must alter; and secondly, in the same place and at the same time, because the judgment of the wisest men will differ as to what is best in the same circumstances. And since every man's way is right in his own sight, and there is the strongest natural disposition in each to maintain his own views against conflicting ones, what an occasion is offered, nay, taking into account the weakness of men, even the best, what a necessity is created for altercations, dissensions and strifes, for jealousies and heart-burnings, and the whole retinue of evils that follow in the train of schism, among Christian brethren living side by side, looking forward to the same home in heaven, and charged with common responsibilities towards a dying world. The bare prospect of such a calamity, on a vastly smaller scale than our eyes have witnessed, stirred Paul's heart within him, and with passionate fervor he exhorts: "Now, I beseech you, brethren, let there be no DIVISIONS among you."

To say, that still, though thus separated, the disciples might preserve the unity of the spirit, and so fulfil the law of love, and present one front against the common enemy, is to beg the whole question. Who is competent to say that the unity of spirit could be preserved in such circumstances? We shall endeavor in another place to prove the contrary—to show that "this devilish spirit of sect" is not so much the cause, as the consequence of the existence of sects, and to a very great extent a necessary consequence. For the present, we appeal to facts. The experiment has been tried. For two or three centuries we have been trying how the plan would work—the plan of multiplying forms of church organization to meet the endlessly varied and ever shifting demands of the human intellect. Our best and wisest men have superintended the experiment. And how has it worked? Let the rent and bleeding body of our Lord reply. The appearance of unity has been totally destroyed. Sectarianism has entered and fed upon the heart of the church. Bitter words have been seconded by bitter deeds. The name of Protestant Christianity

has been made, almost solely on this account, a hissing and reproach throughout half the civilized world. And the exultant cry of the enemy has been, "Behold, how these Christians hate one another!" At length the evil has become intolerable even to ourselves; and we pause, amid the din and tumult of fraternal discord, to inquire where all this will end. Now, we ask, is the Saviour chargeable with this state of things? Has he required his weak and erring people to organize themselves into communities, and given them no instruction, or no intelligible instruction, or no instruction of binding force, as to what kind of a community he would have them form? Has he instituted a visible kingdom, and prescribed no visible organization—a "republic" without a constitution? His blessed word, sufficient to guide his disciples in every other duty—does it fail them here, and leave them to solve one of the most difficult of all earthly problems by the light of their own wisdom? While it describes this kingdom as "one fold having one shepherd," as "a building fitly framed together," (*συναρμολογούμενη*, closely interjointed,) as "one body" animated by one spirit and bound to one head; while it exhibits our Divine Master as entreating for his followers, in every age and throughout the world, "that they all might be one," yea, "perfect in one"; does it leave them in such darkness as to the mode of maintaining this unity, that they must—if not innocently—necessarily be rent to pieces and arranged in hostile bands?

Against this aspersion of the Scriptures, we oppose the concurrent testimony of all Protestant denominations from the times—we had almost said of Novatian—certainly of Luther, down to our own. However widely they may have differed, as to what the Bible taught, all have recognized in the Bible a sufficient and authoritative guide in respect to church organization, and have appealed to Bible authority, each in support of its own, and especially in its testimony against others. Presbyterians have employed it against Episcopalians, Episcopalians against Presbyterians, Independents and Congregationalists against both; and all these against the Papists. And this has been done, not occasionally, by here and there a writer of more zeal than judgment; but consistently and uniformly, with but rare exceptions of persons or periods, by

the most learned, discreet and pious divines, in works of acknowledged authority, in denominational standards and confessions of faith, and in official documents, elaborately drawn and adopted by deliberative assemblies of the greatest weight and wisdom. "Bible authority" has been the only justification offered by nonconformists, separatists and dissenters from existing religious establishments in all ages of the world; their only sufficient shield against the charge of schism and disorder. The Donatists and Æërians, in ancient times, sought, according to Mosheim, to restore the church to its "primitive simplicity;" and they appealed to the Scriptures in support of their doctrines. Constantine, the founder of the Paulicians, one of the most interesting of the ancient "heretical" sects, like Luther, was made a reformer by a copy of the New Testament, which was given him by a travelling stranger, and which, says Gibbon, soon became "the measure of his studies and the rule of his faith." His testimony also was against innovations upon the apostolic church-polity. Against the faithful witnesses of Piedmont, those Abdiels of the earthly church,

"Even them who kept God's truth so pure of old,
When all our fathers worshipped stocks and stones—"

the most serious charges brought by their popish enemies, were, that "they condemn all approved ecclesiastical customs which they do not read of in the gospel;" and "whatsoever is preached without Scripture proof, they account no better than fables." Wickliffe taught that "'tis not lawful for a Christian, after the full publication of the law of Christ, to desire himself any other law for the government of his church," or for Christ's ministers "to be carried away with new offices and more sacraments than Christ used and his apostles, that taughten us all truth."* The Great Reformation, as every body knows, opposed the word of God against the usurpations of the hierarchy and the disorders of the church, as well as the prevalent corruption of the Christian doctrine.†

* Punchard.

† "On the 18th of October, 1512, Luther was made licentiate in theology, and took the following oath: 'I swear to defend the truth of the gospel with all my

Puritanism had its root in the same principle, viz., the sufficiency and authority of the Bible in matters of church government, as well as in matters of faith. Even the selfish and imperious Henry VIII had, at the outset of the English reformation, announced this as the ground and the rule of his proceeding. To the Convocation of 1536, it was "by authority" announced, that "it was the king's pleasure, that the rites and ceremonies of the Church should be reformed by the rules of Scripture, and that nothing was to be retained which did not rest on that authority."* But the reform stopped very far short of this. The king's interests and passions required a far more pliant and available doctrine, and the court divines found no difficulty in inventing one, which ultimately determined the character of the English national church. "Neither party denied that the Bible was a perfect rule of faith; but the court party did not admit it to be a standard of church government and discipline, asserting that it had been left to the judgment of the civil magistrate, etc. The reformers maintained the Scriptures to be the standard of church government and discipline, as well as doctrine. * * They wished to keep close to the Scripture model; * * and they maintained that what Christ had left indifferent, no human laws ought to make necessary."† When, in 1659, Thomas Cartwright commenced at Cambridge his series of tremendous assaults on the English hierarchy, it was with the declaration of this principle. "His system," exclaimed archbishop Whitgift, "consisteth of two false principles and rotten pillars, whereof the one is, That we must of necessity have the

strength.' This solemn vow was to Luther his vocation as a reformer. * * * The infallible authority of the word of God was the first and fundamental principle of the Reformation. Every reform in detail afterwards effected, in doctrine, morals, church government, and public worship, was but a consequence of this first principle."—D'Aubigné Hist. Ref. vol. 1, p. 176.

This was still more fully illustrated in the Swiss, than in the German Reformation. Zwingle, who was far more consistent with himself than Luther, and far less concerned about consequences than Melancthon, was prepared to carry out the common principle of the Reformers with unflinching intrepidity to its results. In his judgment, the word of God alone was to be exalted. "Luther was desirous of retaining in the church whatever was not expressly contradicted by Scripture, while Zwingle was intent on abolishing all that could not be expressly sustained by Scripture. He passed over every intervening age till he reached the times of the apostles, and labored to restore the church to its primitive condition."—D'Aubigné, vol. 3, p. 259.

* Burnet.

† Hetherington, Hist. Westminster Assembly, p. 32.

same kind of government that was in the apostles' time, and is expressed in the Scripture; and no other."* So Hooker, "that standard of appeal for all advocates of the English Establishment against the absurd extravagances of the Puritans," occupies one whole book (the Third) in elaborately refuting "their assertion, that in Scripture there must be of necessity contained a form of church polity, the laws whereof may in no wise be altered." The Scottish reformers made their sole appeal to the law and the testimony; and "though they respected the great continental reformers," says Hetherington, (p. 88,) "they sought the principles of doctrine, discipline and church government from no foreign model, but from the Scriptures alone." The principle is also distinctly recognized in "The Solemn League and Covenant." In the Westminster Assembly of Divines, the leading object proposed, so far as this branch of inquiry was concerned, was in the words of the parliamentary order, to determine "such a discipline and government as may be most agreeable to God's Holy Word," all other considerations being treated as secondary and subordinate. Throughout the protracted and stormy discussion which followed, in which Presbyterians, Independents, and Erastians of various shades and combinations mingled, this was the one point of agreement, the single undisputed axiom, the "unity in diversity," which held them together as a Christian assembly and rendered discussion possible. "What is Christ's institution? What doth the Scripture hold forth? What hath the warrant of God's Holy Word?"—this was invariably the question in debate.† In 1644, while the Assembly was yet in session, the Independent members published their famous "Apologetical Narration, humbly submitted to the Honorable Houses of Parliament," in which they distinctly define their posi-

* Hanbury's Life of Cartwright.

† A circumstance is mentioned by Hetherington, which strongly illustrates the importance attached to this fundamental principle by the Presbyterian party of those times. When the subject of "ruling elders" was under discussion, it was proposed, by way of compromise, to admit them on the ground of expediency. "But this," says the historian, himself a zealous Presbyterian, "was decidedly rejected, especially by the Scottish divines, and by those of the Puritans, or English Presbyterians, who fully understood the nature of the controversy so long waged by their predecessors against admitting into a divine institution any thing of merely human invention." p. 142.

tion and the grounds of their dissent from the decisions of their more numerous brethren. Here again we have an unwavering and earnest appeal to the same standard, "the apostolic directions and the examples of the primitive New Testament churches." But we forbear. The fact is notorious, and lies on the face of all ecclesiastical history and all polemical theology, so far as they relate to this branch of Christian belief and practice. The voice of the Christian world, the consent of the spiritual church catholic, attests the authority of the New Testament in the organization, government and discipline of the church. The opposite doctrine, however it may at times have been adopted by the truly pious under the pressure of biasing influences, belongs to Anti-Christ, and is altogether evil. To this truth, we will barely add, no testimony has been more clear and satisfactory than that borne in the writings of John Robinson and the confession of his excellent church, the "early fathers" of all New Englanders. It has been reserved for the son of the Puritans, for the "New Englander" of the nineteenth century to discover that his fathers, and ours, were all at fault in this matter; that they relied with an altogether too fond and misplaced confidence on the guidance of Scripture in this grave and difficult business of church building; and that instead of instituting elaborate processes of investigation, and writing ponderous tomes of discussion, to determine which of the conflicting parties was in the right, each might have found a brief and all sufficient warrant for his scheme in the formula, *We prefer it.** For our own part we cannot so readily dispose of the venerable authority of the past.

We do not, by any means, regard ourselves as set for the defence of the Puritans, or the Protestants. We

* A writer in the *New Englander* of July, 1845, (p. 433,) informs us that it is now "a conviction quite universal with the Congregationalists, and nearly so with the Presbyterians, that no complete system of ecclesiastical order is enjoined in the New Testament; and that the churches severally are authorized by the Great Head of the Church, to adopt any convenient constitution and rules, etc. The prevalence of these liberal views is of quite recent date. The early expounders of Congregationalism on the one hand, * * and the Presbyterians on the other, were equally zealous to carry out in practice what they conceived to be the primitive and authoritative model of a Christian church." Again, (vol. 4, p. 535,) "J. M. W." tells us that each denomination must adhere to its peculiarities "on the principle of preference."

By the way, is it not a curious and instructive spectacle to see the descendants of the Puritans passing over *en masse* to the positions occupied by the court di-

should be the last to claim infallibility for them, or to attach any undue importance to their opinions—at least, that is not the sin for which we are oftenest rebuked. What they knew aright, they learned from the Bible; but they did not learn it all. The word of God was still in advance of them; it is still in advance of us—far in advance of any "Church Catholic" this side of heaven. We are prepared, therefore, to expect and to welcome new light from that source, and to rejoice in any resolution of difficulties, reconciliation of variances, rectification of errors—in short, any enlargement or elevation of views whatever, that results from a profounder study and leads to a profounder veneration of that wonderful Book. But in the same proportion shall we regard with suspicion and distrust every scheme that proposes, in deference to the wisdom and liberality of the age, to narrow the limits of its jurisdiction or relax the bonds of its authority. This jealousy for the honor of the Scriptures, in all things pertaining to our Lord and his kingdom, we rejoice to know that we feel in common with the most devoted of his followers in former ages; and it is on this account that we recur with peculiar pleasure to the facts above mentioned. This universal and spontaneous appeal to the Scriptures as a standard of church government, we cannot look upon in any other light than as the concurrent testimony of the good and wise of every name to the truth of our proposition; not merely to the antecedent probability that the Saviour would leave directions to his people on this subject, but to the fact that he has; that the Scriptures do actually contain the requisite instruction, however possible it may be for human blindness to miss, or prejudice to pervert it.

Nor, in estimating the value of this testimony, should

vines of Henry VIII and Elizabeth's times? Had the children only been in place of the fathers, what a world of trouble would have been saved to good Queen Bess and "her little black husband," (as old Izaak tells us she used to call Whitgift,) whose days were embittered by those pestilent "scruple-mongers" who would neither be convinced by their reasonings, nor exterminated by their persecutions. Meanwhile, the defenders of prelacy have also found it convenient to shift their quarters; and by borrowing a little from tradition to piece out the imperfections of the Scripture argument—lo! *theirs* is the apostolic church! The parties have in this particular just changed places. How are we to account for this extraordinary transposition? In a quiet foot-note, we may perhaps venture to hint: thus, "Error, wounded, writhes." To Truth alone belong "the eternal years of God."

we overlook the historical relations of the men, and the testimony to the cause of truth and religion in the world. These were the fathers of modern liberty in church and in state, of all that is at once peculiar and excellent in modern civilization and culture; and they owed not a little of the brilliant success whose fruits we are so richly enjoying, to the far-reaching sagacity with which they traced out the practical tendencies of this principle, and the resolute tenacity with which they maintained it. As every step taken by the human mind in its escape from the carnal and corrupting doctrines of the Papacy, is to be referred to the recognition of Scriptural authority in matters of faith; so every successive improvement in the frame and polity of the church visible has been a concession, more or less cordial, to the claims of the New Testament as a standard of church organization, and an attempt to approach nearer to the model it exhibits. Just so far as the emancipation of the church in any part of Christendom has advanced, from the rigors of priestly domination, from the supremacy of kings, from the entanglements of State alliance, or from any other admitted evil of the kind, it has been under the guidance of holy and faithful men, who feared God, and revered his word, and, to the extent of their knowledge and ability, would have the authority of Christ regarded in the order of his house. On the other hand, such reforms have always been resisted, and after a while arrested, on the ground of some discretionary power, less or more, residing in the church, whereby she is at liberty to depart from, or stop short of the Scripture model in accommodation to circumstances.

This doctrine of a discretionary power, we have said, belongs to Anti-Christ. We make the remark, not invidiously, but from a solemn conviction of its truth and importance. The doctrine originated with Rome, and forms a necessary and appropriate part of her system. It is out of place in the creed of a Protestant. By connecting with it the ideas of church infallibility and a perpetuation of apostolical authority in her supreme head, she was able to adopt it heartily and carry it out boldly to its results. By making herself, and not the Scriptures, the repository of divine truth and the medium through which God makes known his will, she could, without

any appearance of inconsistency, assume the right to give herself what shape she might prefer, and still be called the church of Christ. When Protestants have assumed to exercise the same right, it has always been from the fear of too thorough a reformation, and with such modifications of the claim as betray a sense of its inconsistency with the fundamental principle of their system. Thus Luther, after sundering the most intolerable of the papal bonds with "the sword of the Spirit," suddenly staid his hand. And why? Because he could not bear to cut entirely loose "from the church of all preceding ages;"* and so he persuaded himself that he might "retain" so many of the inventions of Anti-Christ as he found not "expressly condemned" in Scripture. Subsequent reformers were dissatisfied with the extent to which he exercised his "discretionary power;" and, in successive ages and various lands, just in proportion as the pressure of Bible authority has been felt, have further and still further changes been demanded, until we now may follow out a series of church organizations, so called, in actual existence, commencing at the one extreme with Rome and proceeding towards the Bible at the other, and reaching—almost thither. Now the point of our argument is this; that just so far as the reformers have been reformers, the Scriptures have made them such; and wherever they have stopped in their progress, whether at few or many removes from the sect of the beast, they have stayed themselves on this convenient doctrine of "discretionary power in the church herself."

But it may be asked: Does not the great diversity of conclusions at which good men have arrived, while all professed to draw their opinions from the Bible, prove that, after all, there is no form of church polity clearly taught therein? We answer, just as much as the diversity of sentiment among Christians on other points of faith and practice, proves that there is a defect or an ambiguity in the standard to which they in common resort. In either case, it is so perfectly easy to account for the diversity by a reference to the imperfections and prejudices of inquirers, and the numberless biasing influences which from without continually affect their processes of investi-

* D'Aubigne, vol. III, 259.

gation, especially when we take into account the manner in which the Scriptures convey their instructions, that the inference is perfectly inconclusive. That we do not find drawn out in the New Testament a formal scheme, a systematic treatise of church organization and government,* which would anticipate all conceivable questions and preclude the possibility of misapprehension, is certainly true. Such a mode of exhibiting the subject is wholly unnecessary, and would contradict the entire analogy of revelation. It has not pleased our Heavenly Father in this way to make known his will. We should look in vain for a formal code of Christian ethics; but do we thence infer that it is left to every individual disciple to act according to his own judgment in the service of his Master? or that the Scriptures contain no authoritative model of Christian life and character? Nor do we find any where in the Bible a digested system of theological truth; does it then contain no system at all? and is it a matter of indifference what is the form of the Christian's belief?

We claim, therefore, the testimony not merely of most Protestants, but of all Protestantism in our favor, and of all that is distinctive and illustrious in modern civilization and culture. The cause of liberty and learning must acknowledge an indebtedness to the firm resistance made by our fathers to the usurpations of the hierarchy, whose sanction and example were, during the dark ages, the chief support of despotism in government and in thought, and which, by the way, were neither more nor less than simple infractions of the constitution of the church visible. In that resistance, the authority of Scripture alone sustained, alone justified them. They claimed rights which Christ had given them as members of his body; some more, some less; and every claim so made and so sustained has been, or is to be, successful.

* "As the New Testament contains no systematic treatise on doctrine or morals, but leaves us to construct a system of belief and practice, by a diligent comparison of its various texts and the application of its general precepts [and, we would add, its narratives]; so neither does it present any formal digest of ecclesiastical canons, but leaves us to frame our scheme of discipline and polity by a careful analysis and extension of its general principles" [and recorded facts]. Smyth on Presbytery and Prelacy, p. 51.

In the section from which this sentence is extracted, Dr. S. strongly states the doctrine for which we contend, and remarks that the opposite opinion "is now generally and justly exploded." More justly, we fear, than generally. He is himself a whole-hearted Bible Presbyterian. Such used to be more common.

High churchmen find no other ground on which to base a claim to the name and authority of a church, than that of historical connection with the Papacy. 'The recognition of such a dependence on "the church of all ages," they deem essential to the idea and the fact of *visible unity*. And one of their loudest complaints against "the dissenting denominations" is, that the system of the latter is wholly destitute of a principle of visible unity, that it has an inherent and necessary tendency to divisions and schisms. Thus Mr. Palmer, after quoting from the *Eclectic Review* a frank acknowledgment of "the inveterate and incurable sectarianism that characterizes British Christianity," proceeds as follows :

"But dissenters persuade themselves that the evil does not arise from their own principles. 'Can it be shown,' they say, 'that the tendency of the congregational system is to generate and foster the evils under review?' I say, it can be clearly shown. The dissenting system, the principle of dissent, is exactly the cause of all their divisions; it leads necessarily to tumult, division, separation, heresy without limit. * * According to them, a church is a voluntary society of professing saints, which is complete in itself, subject to no jurisdiction but its own, competent to make and execute its own laws, acknowledging no rule but Scripture, and possessing the ability to ascertain its directions. The voice of the society decides every thing; every measure is proposed and discussed, and the majority determines the matter. Such is the system and principle of dissent; whence it is clear that frequent discussion, debate, voting are essential to it, and therefore there must be a perpetual excitement to anger, jealousy, party-spirit, ambition and all the elements of division. * * * Nor is this all. It is the principle of dissenters, that no human authority can be admitted in religious matters. Therefore the minority in any question in their churches cannot feel it their duty to yield to the majority, because the judgment of that majority is merely human; and hence it follows that discussions among them are interminable, except by a total separation. * * Peaceable and Christian separation, (I quote the words of a dissenter,) when separation becomes inevitable or expedient, is the MAXIM of the congregational system. It is clear then, that the principle of division is a principle of dissent. * * * According to their principle, a church is a mere voluntary association. The motive for entering it, is the opinion of the individual that it will be conducive to his edification to do so. He is equally at liberty to depart from it, when he judges it expedient. * * Certainly this reasoning is perfectly correct, and founded on a sort of silent estimate of the real character of dissenting communities. They are human societies. The will of man makes them, regulates them, unmakes them." *Treatise on the Church*, vol. 1, p. 373.

We confess that we know of but one sufficient answer to this reasoning. We cannot join in sneering at the idea

of visible unity. We should as soon think of sneering at that of a visible church; nor do we know of any other kind of unity which a visible church, as such, can have. We should reply by directing Mr. P. to one of the items in his own enumeration of the tenets of "dissenting" churches, — "acknowledging no rule but Scripture." That rule, we should tell him, we acknowledge in this, as in all respects; and no other. We should deny, that according to our principle, (we could speak only for ourselves,) a church is a human society, a mere voluntary association; that the only or chief motive for entering it, is self-edification; and that it may be deserted on the ground of expediency. On the contrary, we firmly hold that the church is an institution of God, to which he hath given a body as it hath pleased him; that all men are bound to enter it "voluntarily," and from the concurrent motives of love to him, love to it, and concern for their own spiritual edification; that none are at liberty to depart from it so long as it retains the constitution which he has prescribed for it, and on the other hand, it has no authority to change that constitution. Both the church and the individual are responsible to God for their conduct, and by the Scriptures both will be justified or condemned. But we see not how those can use this answer, who concede that the Scriptures furnish no law on the subject, or none that is binding on the conscience now. The Scriptures are made to sanction endless divisions, according to human notions of expediency.

There are persons whose "liberality" stretches to this extent; but we do not hesitate, we cannot hesitate, with the Bible in our hands and the Spirit of truth in our hearts, to pronounce such liberality unevangelical, and an evidence, so far as it goes, that they who exercise it have need themselves to be taught "which be the first principles of the oracles of God." Take, for instance, the doctrinal summary adopted by the Evangelical Alliance as a basis of union. It has, indeed, been condemned as unintelligible and indeterminable; but no complaint could be more unfounded. Every body knows full well what is meant by "evangelical views," in the points enumerated; and though the expression admits much variety of opinion, it yet draws a line of separation between orthodox Christians and others, which will be clearly discernible

to all whose own position is unequivocal, whether on one side of it or the other. There are some varieties of religious character and sentiment, which it requires more than human discrimination to place any where in a scriptural classification. At all events, the great mass of genuine Christians would understand it, and understand it alike, and pronounce it an excellent summary of Christian doctrine, definite, comprehensive, and, so far as it goes, scriptural. They could not fellowship as Christians those who rejected any part of it. Yet the Scriptures contain nothing similar to it in form; and there is scarcely a point in the whole series, in regard to which the evangelical view is not discarded by some sect that claims to be Christian, and embraces perhaps some true Christians in its communion. What then? Do we hesitate as to its scripturalness? Do we doubt the fulness or clearness of the revelation? Do we admit the innocence of unbelief, or the propriety and safety of indifference? Do we find it at all difficult to account for the prevalence of errors on these points, without conceding either the insufficiency of Scripture, or the "discretionary power" of Christians to form their own system of belief? Why then should it seem strange that the Bible should be misapprehended, even by good men yet in the flesh, with regard to matters which, however important and clearly revealed, are confessedly not among "the first principles" of the gospel, and the evasion of which is consequently not incompatible with the possession of the Christian character.

There is really no difficulty here at all. Instruction is always given in the Scripture in a form adapted to test the earnestness of our desires after truth, and to afford an opportunity for progress in knowledge. Severe study, humble, prayerful, and long protracted study, is requisite for a full development of the scriptural scheme, not only to the individual mind, but to the church at large; and, often, a truth which lies spread over the whole face, or is woven into the entire tissue of revelation, may be obscured to the view of the people of God for ages, until the patient Providence of the All-wise has, by long and circuitous discipline, brought their minds and hearts into the state required for its recognition. This is a familiar truth, and its application is obvious. In such

cases, particular individuals or parts of the church are in advance of others in the discovery; and these perhaps long bear their testimony in the face first of penalties and persecutions, then of reproaches and insults, and finally of contemptuous silence or a benevolent toleration, almost as grievous to be borne, until light breaking in from other quarters, their testimony is at length seen to be according to the word of God, and the whole church now witnesses the truth which before she labored to destroy. Why may it not be so with the subject under consideration?

What is the history of opinions on this subject in the church? Let us see how far all can agree as to the facts. It will not be denied, that the apostles organized churches, and "set things in order" therein by virtue of their apostolical authority; that during the apostolic age these churches retained a substantial uniformity of plan,* and mutual relations of intercommunion and intercourse through which their unity of spirit manifested itself freely and powerfully; that, in short, by virtue of these several bonds, they constituted one fraternity, and as such were recognized by all the world. At a later period, as all Protestants will agree, in consequence of having abandoned the guidance of the Scriptures, and substituted that of tradition and a discretionary power in the church, a total departure from this primitive ecclesiastical system took place, simultaneously with a more fearful apostacy from the primitive faith; and that all sorts of corruption and mischief were the consequence. Nor will it be denied that one of the great problems of the Reformation was, to reconstruct the visible kingdom of Christ after the inspired original. Whether the undertaking were wise or not, the fact can hardly be questioned. But now comes a difficulty. The Word of God is unbound, and has "free course" among the people. The right of private judgment has been established; and all are eagerly consulting the Divine Oracles and forming systems of opinion according to their respective interpretations of the

* Something has been said, indeed, of certain peculiarities of usage which distinguished the Jewish from the Gentile churches in the apostles' time. But it has never been claimed that these affected the fundamental principles of organization, as e. g. the terms of admission, the grounds of exclusion, the essential rights and responsibilities of membership, the power of officers, etc.

record. Those interpretations differ; in some respects widely and variously. How could it be otherwise? So long has the human mind been cut off from these sources of knowledge; so thoroughly corrupted have the most fundamental ideas and terms of religion become, by reason of popish perversions; so extremely defective and vicious are the very principles of interpretation, which have become current under the false teachings of the hierarchy; and so large a measure of the Anti-Christian element still mingles in all the streams of human influence; that it would be strange indeed if the one record of inspiration were not variously read, and the very spirit of obedience did not lead to diverse manifestations. Here was the birth of Sect, the ill-proportioned hydra-headed child of Ignorance (daughter of Anti-Christ) and a Partial Zeal. But shall he be immortal? We trow not. Him, with all the progeny of "that wicked," shall the Lord "consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming." Amid the clash of opinions and the violence of party zeal which disfigure the early annals of the reformed church, and call forth the taunts and reproaches of her foes, we have always this confidence. We know that all cannot be right; we know that so long as any remain in the wrong, strifes and contentions will continue; but we believe that "knowledge will be increased." Wide as the poles asunder in every other respect, they bow to the authority of the same standard and are all under the guidance of its Divine Author. The very ardor of discussion drives them to the study of that standard, and the invocation of the Spirit's aid. Now if the Bible be consistent with itself, and God be able to shed the needful light on the sacred page, how can this process fail to remove the grounds of difference, and result in a substantial oneness of opinion? How far have we been permitted to see this blessed work already advanced! Who does not know that many formulæ of faith, which were once regarded as irreconcilably opposed, and the defenders of which were respectively prepared to consign their opponents as hopeless heretics to the terrors of vindictive wrath in this world and in the world to come, are now understood to be but different aspects of myriad-sided truth, and to be held by the opposing brethren with such qualifications and in such combina-

tions as to make them virtually one? Differences, doubtless, remain; some serious ones. But after what we have seen accomplished, and in view of the divine aids vouchsafed, shall we despair of the remainder?

And to return to our questions, how has it been with opinions respecting the form of the primitive church polity? In the early morning of the Reformation, there was as much bewilderment and contrariety of view, as much of sharp and angry disputation on this, as on any other point. With the advance of day, has more light been shed upon the field of controversy, and is there any approach to unanimity? The question hardly needs an answer. Every scholar knows, that among enlightened interpreters of the New Testament, many long mooted points are set at rest by common consent; and many features of existing organizations originally adopted and defended on Bible grounds, if retained at all, are justified in some other way. If less time had been expended by those distinguished men whom God has given in successive ages to be the lights of his church, in devising systems of their own, and getting them at great expense of labor and influence into operation, in managing and eulogizing and defending them; and if the same time, talent, care and labor had been devoted to ascertaining the will of God on this subject, as revealed in his Holy Word and illustrated by his providence, with a perfect readiness to abandon all personal "preferences," and to adopt implicitly the result of their inquiries; who can tell but that long ere this, the faithfulness of our Lord would have been vindicated, and his people have been "perfect in one?" But despite all the obstacles to the progress of truth on this subject, such has been the advancement already made towards entire identity of opinion in respect to the apostolic form of church polity, that we hazard nothing in asserting, were there now prevalent in all Christian denominations the same conviction of the binding authority of that model, as that in which many of those denominations originated, the church would this day be nearer to a perfect, glorious, divine unity, than the Evangelical Alliance is likely to bring about in half a century.

As one difficulty disappears, however, another rises. While learned men in different communions are approxi-

mating to agreement as to what the apostolic churches were, the doctrine that they are not to be regarded as furnishing a model for universal imitation, has lately been revived and is becoming very popular. Stated strongly and somewhat plausibly in the works of such men as Neander, D'Aubigné and Whately, and in that form spread far and wide among the churches, we must not be surprised to hear it echoed and reëchoed in a thousand forms throughout the land. "In an ordinary, obscure and trifling writer," to use the language of the excellent archbishop on another occasion, "all this confusion of thought and common-place declamation might as well be left unnoticed; but it is due to the general ability and celebrity of such authors, and to the cause of truth on which they exert so powerful an influence, that errors of this kind should be exposed." An attempt to do this we propose to make. But we have occupied as much space as we can afford to this subject in this number, and for the present, though somewhat reluctantly, interrupt the course of our argument at this point.

J. H. R.

Madison University, N. Y.

ARTICLE II.

MAN'S NEED OF A DIVINE REVELATION.

It is our object, in the present article, to contemplate man in his unaided attempts to gain a knowledge of those truths which lie hidden in nature, but which are wholly revealed only in the word of God.

Truth is the conception of things as they are; and "those propositions are true, which express things as they are." When, therefore, we seek for the truth in any thing, we endeavor to behold it just as it appears to the Omniscient Eye. With our limited faculties we strive to comprehend facts and theories, as they are comprehended by the infinite mind of God. And while creation is so vast, while the machinery of the universe is so intricate and so magnificent, and while the productions of nature in all the mazes of their endless variety proclaim in themselves the work of an infinite mind, is it strange that man should see a thousand chimeras, should lead himself into endless contradictions, and often stumble amid the intricacies of nature in exploring a path to the truth? How various are the paths which different people have taken. The Persian sees in the brightness of the sun and in the seeming regularity of his movements, not the work of a God, but, "the Light, the Creative word," God himself. The Hindoo mother beholds in her deity, a being pleased with the sacrifice of her children and with her own sufferings; and she patiently does and endures what the voice of nature may have proclaimed to others to be sinful. The American savage buries his chieftain's favorite horse with its master, and bids his spirit speed to a more beautiful hunting-ground. In their various homes they have knelt at the shrine of the same nature. They all believe that they have listened to her perfect truths; yet one believes it sinful to destroy any living creature, lest he should disturb the migrated soul of a fellow being; another regards the earth as scarcely more than a hunting and battle-ground, whereon to pursue his game and de-

stroy his enemies. Each one, satisfied with the truth of his creed, lays himself down at the hour of death, believing himself not wholly without a knowledge of God and of his future condition; perhaps often contented, as if nothing more were to be known.

Were men called upon first to cast away the truths of revelation, to shut out all the light they have ever received from the throne of God, and then to search for truth, we can easily conceive the result. If a man has been born and bred in China, he will adopt the morality of Confucius. If his parents have led him in his childhood to a Mohammedan mosque, his only religion will be—"God is great, and Mohammed is his prophet." If his mind has been moulded in Atheism, he will advocate its principles till the light of another theory dispels the darkness of that, the most abhorrent to our natures. Aside from the teachings of revelation, truth and error may be received alike; and while they have not internal evidence of divine authority, while they are not proved with the clearness of mathematical demonstration, and there is no test to apply to them, who can dare to affirm that he himself is in the right, and the rest of the world in the wrong? Alas, for man's boasted wisdom! Let a few centuries or years pass by, and new theorizers starting up, demonstrate the falsity of the doctrines of those who have been once regarded as oracles of wisdom.

The mind of the savage receives the tradition and the worship of his fathers, and satisfies the natural feeling of pious reverence with what they had received as true. Occupied as he is with supplying the wants of his body, his mind, rendered active and wild in the pursuits peculiar to his mode of life, seldom investigates its own movements. He rarely attempts to penetrate the mysteries of nature, or to solve the grand movements of the universe. He sits at evening and gazes into the expanse of the firmament, and both ignorant and careless of the laws which regulate all created things, he regards them all as the work of the Great Spirit, the First Great Cause. Satisfied with this general contemplation, he advances no farther.

The philosopher lays wide open the book of nature, and studies long and carefully. Page after page is slowly

devoured by his searching mind. He compares, he reasons, he theorizes, builds up and tears down, imagines and invents, till he believes his foundation firmly laid upon the eternal rock of truth. Slowly and carefully he raises his structure; the world gather around to view its harmonious proportions and striking beauties. He sees with joy the operations of the mind laid open; he believes that he has established correct principles of virtue; that he has discovered the origin of sin and misery; and he has formed, in his own opinion, a perfect theory of the movements of nature, both material and immaterial. For a while his philosophy is regarded as the only true philosophy, founded upon reason and experience, and others only build upon and add to what he has already erected. But at length a daring genius, perceiving in it a train of argument not adapted to his own mode of thinking, boldly proclaims his own thoughts, which by their novelty draw around him admirers and disciples, who are ready at once to regard all philosophers before him as only ingenious theorizers. That which was but now the truth, is considered error; another image has been reared, more beautiful than the last, and its votaries worship at its shrine. Thus for two hundred years Greece received the speculations of Thales and Pythagoras, as rays proceeding from the light of unchanging truth; at length the purer light of Socrates and Plato streamed in upon the souls of men, and the latter became the centres of truth, around which all other teachers revolved, and by whose reflected light they shone.

Thus has the world been ever changing in its ideas of truth; and nearly every century has presented a new and varying system of philosophy. Where, therefore, amid the learned reasoning of man, shall we discover the truth? What school of philosophy can maintain that it sees things as they really exist, that its vision penetrates the secret depths, unfathomed by the preceding school of speculators? Can the Deist, when he tries to measure the illimitable universe with the rule of his own feeble and finite intellect? Or the Atheist, while he gropes in the awful darkness of his gloomy skepticism, and pronounces the beautiful creations of nature "the work of chance"? Or can even we of this latest and most enlightened age, with the power of examining the reason-

ing of all former ages, of comparing the variety of their demonstrations, and benefitted by all the light of all past philosophy, can we, if we shut out the light of divine revelation, clearly and beyond cavil establish the principles of truth,—in government, in religion, in morals;—the truth concerning God and man, the divine plan, human character, condition and destiny;—the truth which we and all future generations must receive? Let history furnish the reply. And yet we almost daily hear of some new social system, of some new order of things, or form of government. Here, man breaks over all forms of government, and prostrates himself before the Goddess of reason; and there he enjoys a community of property with his fellows, whose hearts his system is to rid of those evil passions, which Holy Writ informs us pervade all hearts. But these fancies all pass away with those who give them birth. They will soon be entombed in the sepulchre of the past, with the various and foolish speculations of man's unaided mind.

Well might the philosophers of ancient Greece, almost in despair, exclaim—“*Τί ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια;*” What is truth? Where are the faculties which can penetrate far beyond self-evident truths? One mind builds up what another tears down. As we turn over page after page in the history of philosophy, and discover the fickle and changing characteristics of what the learned in various ages have taught, and what their numerous disciples have received as true, we are seized with sad and fearful doubts as to the capacities of our reasoning powers. We feel humbled in the contemplation of what some have almost worshipped as the strength and majesty of the human mind. We feel ourselves constrained to confess that mere unaided reason leads us but a little way. We may seem to ourselves to be advancing in the right path; but others soon appear to point out our wanderings.

Notwithstanding the boasts of human philosophy, man must bow down in the littleness of his mental powers before the infinity of truth, which, unaided, he cannot attain. The Deist must look beyond nature, if he would gain more than an indistinct conception of the character of God. The philosopher of Greece, though he be a Plato, must hesitate before he promulgates those sentiments which, cleansed a little from the dust of this world,

would glisten almost as with the sparks of revelation ; but which, in ignorance of revelation, he sees only by the light of his own reason.

It is pleasant to turn from the sad picture of human infirmity, and to remember that God has pitied our weakness ; that he knew that without him we should fall into the depths of darkness. It is gratifying to the soul that is lost in doubts and uncertainties, to know that he has given us his word to guide our steps and to point us to the truth. It is gratifying to know that there is a test by which to try the speculations of philosophy ;—a test which has been proved perfect in the line of centuries long past, and which has not only withstood the attacks of many successive generations, but has become more firmly fixed on its foundation by the unavailing assaults of its adversaries. We who have conformed our sentiments to the word of God, who have tested our theories by the aid of revelation, have a security on which to rest. We have a divine guide, to lead us on our doubtful way. The early martyrs felt its power and value, when they compared heathen mythology with the word of God taught them by the Spirit, and died joyfully, rather than surrender the truth. Luther was animated by it, when he aroused the people of Germany from their ignorance of the word of God ; when he raised aloft that lantern of truth, and, applying the test of its heavenly light, exhibited the deformities of the “ Man of Sin.”

Let him who is wearied with the conflicting speculations of man go to that fountain, the revealed truth of God. There let him drink those hallowed inspirations which the mind of man never of itself originated. Then will he acknowledge with Cato, that Plato “ does reason well,” for a human philosopher, upon the soul and an hereafter ; but better than even Plato will he penetrate those eternal truths which enwrap the soul and its future condition. We must submit even Plato to the divine test. And while some parts of his philosophy will be made to glow with a brighter beauty, his defects will be also discovered, by contrast with that pure and perfect standard.

As we examine, with the light of divine truth, the speculations of various nations, some beauties of thought will be found, which, borne along in the current of tradition, perhaps from the early times of the patriarchs, still

bear the traces of our divine philosophy. Thus a sect of the Hindoos makes the great end of individual being to consist in becoming united to, in becoming one with Brahma, the creator of the universe. So does the Christian strive to be like unto, to be one with Jesus Christ. The Chinese give man two souls, the soul that feels and the soul that knows. At death, the first returns to the earth, whence it sprang; the second to heaven, its original dwelling place. How similar is this to the carnal nature, which clings to the earth; and the spiritual nature, the gift of God, which seeks communion with him. But amidst how much rubbish of heathenism and extravagance are these jewels lost!

Man's fallen nature has led him far astray; yet God has given the light of truth to guide our steps. In his word we behold that truth. We can comprehend it, as clearly as finite powers can comprehend what is infinite. Though our feeble intellects can never realize the infinity of the attributes of Jehovah, yet as we turn from pernicious error, and from the unsatisfying truths of nature to feast our souls with the richness and glory of revelation, shall we not thank God, not only for this light, but also that ours is a state of growth in intellectual and moral power? Though faint may be the glimmerings of truth upon earth, we have hope that hereafter they will shine upon us with a brighter radiance, purifying our fallen natures, destroying the love of a deceitful world, and educating the mind to those true and large conceptions which befit a rational, immortal and expanding soul, meditating on the glories, and dwelling amid the scenes of eternity.

L. B. R.

ARTICLE III.

INTRODUCTION TO THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF LÜCKE.

The fundamental thought contained in the Introduction, which is the substantial thing discussed in the gospel, is the idea of the incarnate, original, antemundane divine Logos in Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God. The principal problem to be solved, is the nature of the Logos. The idea of the Logos, in this connection, is not a general one, or one that is in itself an intellectual religious conception; but rather a technical, theological idea. John has neither explained nor interpreted it. In an isolated, abrupt manner, he so uses it, that one necessarily sees that he presupposes a knowledge of its meaning in a fixed historical connection. Without correct views of this connection, the interpretation can neither be discovered nor explained. John's Logos, therefore, must constantly be misunderstood—the enigma is proposed, but there is no solution.

From remarks which have been previously made, it appears that the Logos-idea of John is to be explained in a historical manner, and from this, the conception is to be more perfectly developed. But the historical discussion alone, is insufficient. In order to find the established course of thought, by means of which the idea of the Logos is unlocked, the grammatical use of language in the time previous, the particular Biblical usage, and the immediate design of John in his introductory verses must be determined.

According to general usage, ὁ λόγος can be translated *word*, or *reason*. If the position of the phrase, ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (Rev. 19: 13,) were better determined, the idea would evidently be more certain and more easy. But John says, at first, simply, ὁ λόγος, and then gives us the relation of the Logos to God by the phrase, ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος πρὸς τὸν θεόν, and θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. Consequently there can

exist no doubt, that when the genitive-relation was to be expressed, ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ would stand for it. But when ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ does occur, as it does elsewhere in the New Testament, e. g. in John's other writings, it signifies the most ancient word of God, the most ancient Scriptures, or the sermon of the gospel. Still though this phrase harmonizes, in many respects, with the Logos idea of the Introduction, it is not the same. Certainly the expression ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, John 1: 14, was not so employed in the Introduction.

It may be still farther remarked, that except in Biblical usage, ὁ λόγος is used for *reason*, either of God or man, neither by John nor by any other writer. This, in Biblical usage, is expressed in various relations, which are explained by the connection—sometimes by πνεῦμα and by κάρδια and even by νοῦς—1 Cor. 2: 16. As a divine attribute, the reason of God is called ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ. Also in the classics ὁ λόγος may be called *understanding*, i. e. the objective knowledge of things and their relations, but not the faculty of reason or subjective knowledge. The general signification of λόγος, in relations similar to the one in John's prologue, both in the Old and New Testament, is *speech* or *word*. And indeed ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ expresses the symbolical idea of the creating, revealing, governing and lawgiving activity of God. That John, under the term λόγος, has particularly intended to express the idea of the creating and revealing word of God, by a reference of his first verses, John 1: 1—3, to the account given of the creation, Gen. 1: 1, can be settled beyond the shadow of a doubt.

The word of God, in the Scriptures, is not an immanent attribute, but always an objective action of God in the world, and in various relations to the world. That interpretation, therefore, which proceeds from the idea of a divine attribute, must be set aside, if Scripture analogy is to be followed. John describes the Logos as a personality—as a person who, though with God, πρὸς τὸν θεόν, yet creates and develops himself in a manner distinct from God. Particularly does he dwell upon the thought, that this Logos became flesh, (v. 14,) and shone forth in Jesus Christ as a distinct historical person. But however this enigmatical word may be understood, it certainly must mean something more than a rhetorical or poetical

personification. In harmony with the manner of speech employed by the Baptist, and by Jesus himself respecting the preëxistence, i. e. the existence of the Son of God before the creation, which *ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος* certainly signifies, John could not have intended anything less than a dogmatic manifestation, or an hypostasis of the Logos. But from what historical, connected and dogmatic ideas could the grammatical and distinct idea of John's Logos be deduced?

Three things, of particular importance, present themselves to us, which may form a fair basis of reasoning with respect to the *λόγος*. That which is the most nearly connected with it as to time, is the doctrine of Philo respecting the Logos. But the doctrine of Philo, as seen in the unity of the Jewish Theology, discovers two original modes of thought, as contained in the Old Testament; viz. the doctrine of the Word of God, and the doctrine of the Wisdom of God. These are the most ancient sources of Philo's doctrine; and yet as to time, they are the second and third historical bases of John's prologue.

I.

The idea of the Logos acquires its essential development in the history of the Jewish Theology. By the general and particular revelation of God to Adam, a revelation rendered still more fixed in Abraham and Moses, the idea of the only true God—the monotheistical, ethical God-idea—was implanted in the mind with so much energy, that it must have developed and unfolded a still stronger germ of spiritual life. This expansion of the idea is brought out in two ways: first, progressively; by the revelation of God in the providential care of his people: secondly, by the partial development of the Jewish mind itself, which had received an impetus in consequence of the revelation. The most ancient theology is perfectly religious and positive. The objective purport of it is, consequently, nothing else than a divine revelation, the matter of an immediate, religious experience. It is to be examined according to its foundation, its contents, and its form. It leads us, therefore, necessarily to a knowledge of the attributes of God, as fixing the appropriate character and meaning to the revelation. Its basis is general. It lies both in the nature of man and the idea

of God. Man cannot, by his own faculties or by intuition, understand the essence or the nature of God, except by revelation and by contemplating the attributes of God. Every revelation of God was preëminently conveyed to the mind of the Hebrew by the idea of the Word; and every divine attribute, or attributive representation, by the idea of Wisdom. Therefore, the unfolding of the doctrine respecting the Word and the Wisdom constitute the chief points of interest in the most ancient theology.

§ 1. The first indication of the progressiveness of the ancient theology is the Mosaic account of the creation. Here we find, at the creation, the divine revelation established with respect to the divine essence as Spirit, and with reference to its form as Word, or language, in which the Spirit operates and declares itself. Concerning the Spirit as the Word of God, there are free symbolical expressions and analogical ideas, which are derived from human comparisons; but in consequence of the monotheistic principle of faith, the Hebrew could not consider the revelation of God at the creation, otherwise than, as to his nature, a Spirit, and as to his form, a Word.

This idea, however, of a revelation under the symbol of the Word is not peculiarly Hebraistic. The religion of Zoroaster also represents the world-creating Word, as the most immediate and most ancient revelation of the Infinite—as the mode in which the benevolent Deity exists and creates. And in the Veda may be found also a discussion respecting the creative Word, Brahma, and the goddess Vach. But the Old Testament doctrine did not originate there. It is only similar to it. The Mosaic history may not be older than Moses. The standing-point of information directs to a much earlier than the Mosaic epoch; yet in its connection, it is both more ancient and very different from the doctrine of the Word in the religious system of Zoroaster and the Vedas.

The fundamental idea of the Old Testament seems to be, that the revelation of God is essentially in the form of the Word, and energetically that of the divine Spirit or divine will. The Hebrew poetry preserves this method of representation until a still later period. But gradually, as knowledge advances, we find, as the essential type of all divine revelation, the idea of upholding and govern-

ing, until finally the word is separated from the power of the Spirit. All divine light and life, in the world, in nature and history, exists in the law, the promises, the prophecies, the providences and instructions, the prophetic gift, etc. All this is the working of the divine Spirit in the form of the divine Word—*דְּבַר יְהוָה*, *lógos* or *ῥῆμα*, *τοῦ θεοῦ*, or *συνόιον*, etc.—Genesis 4: 14, 41. Ps. 33: 6, 9; 93: 5; 107: 20; 147: 18; 148: 8; Is. 2: 1, 3; Jer. 1: 4, 11, 13; 2: 1, 4; Is. 48: 16; 61: 1; etc.

Again, poetic personifications are very frequent. Ps. 147: 15; Is. 55: 10, 11. They lie in the nature of poetic language. But the most ancient personifications of the divine Word, containing a dogmatic germ and a dogmatic tendency, are preformations of the later hypostases of the divine Word. There are two kinds, worthy of particular attention. First, those instances in which the divine Word is exhibited objectively in the Law. In the Law, the Word of God is placed preëminently before the people, and possesses in itself a self-existing life and worth. Secondly, those instances where the divine attributes are transferred to the Word of God, and there is an identical parallelism between the Word of God and God himself. The Word of God is true, eternal, full of wisdom and almighty. Ps. 33: 4; 119: 89, 104, 105; Is. 40: 8; Jer. 23: 29, etc. For the sake of a more immediate and essential expression of the divine mind and will, the Word becomes the Word of the divine character and nature, and identifies itself still more perfectly with it. But gradually it must have been considered as something more than a divine subject. Still, the oldest canonical account carries us no farther than to a distinctive tendency and effort to transfer the poetic personification of the divine Word to the dogmatic personification, or hypostasis.

§ 2. At a later period, the doctrine of the Word spoken of in the Old Testament was developed in the following manner. Only in proportion as the religious and spiritual life is exalted and made distinctive, and there arises a more abundant experience and perception of the divine revelation, can one know the attributive nature of God. Thus it is in the Old Testament. The Hebrew, in accordance with the natural course of knowledge, in early times conceived of God and praised him as the Wise, the Al-

mighty. But to know what is the moral perfection of God and what his universal plan of government, requires a long series of religious experience and believing meditation. Only to the pious sage, did the Wisdom of God disclose itself as the substance of the divine perfection, the eternal light, and the eternal ruler or governor of the world. Consequently, we find that it is only in the later books that the doctrine concerning Wisdom is particularly unfolded. The chief places of interest are the book of Job and the Proverbs of Solomon. We take for the chronology of both books about the time of the exile.

In the Theodicea (chap. 28,) of the book of Job, divine Wisdom is represented in comparison with human wisdom as unsearchable and unfathomable, even to the wisest. God alone knows the way to it. He alone knows its place. It sees even to the end of the earth and throughout the whole heaven. It puts the world in a balance. It weighs the waters with a measure. It gives law to the rain, and a path to the water-courses. By it God declares himself—reveals himself—represents and comprehends himself. To man it speaks, "Behold the fear of the Lord is Wisdom, and to avoid evil is understanding." Thus Wisdom is represented as alone fully knowing and revealing God—as God objectively revealed in creating and regulating the world—and as an endless problem which man with humility is to solve, but which can be solved only in proportion as he fears God and avoids evil.

The view in Proverbs is more complete and from a different standing point. As sinful folly, *בְּסִילִית*, is described poetically, chap. 7 : 1 and 9 : 13 seq., as a harlot who deceives, spoils and puts to death her votaries; so by way of antithesis, Wisdom is described as the cardinal virtue—as that which seeks and calls for men, and rewards them with her good things. Wisdom in its perfection, the Wisdom of God is the basis and true type of humanity. She calls herself the first born of God—8 : 22. Jehovah has created or formed her (*קָדָה*) in the beginning, or as the beginning of his activity, before his works. From the beginning, before the origin of the earth, has he established her for queen and governess of the world. Thus, as the original daughter of God, was she with God—by his side—*אֵצֶל*—as the artist by whom God or-

dains every thing—the delight of God—his beloved child day by day. And as she pleases God, is eternally his pleasure, the blessed, happy Wisdom, so is she, upon the earth, the joy of men, every thing which they seek and love, blessing them with the knowledge of truth, with virtue and art, with the smile of heaven and eternal salvation. The connection and the tenor of the entire context establishes the fact beyond a doubt, that the Wisdom of God is here only personified in a poetical loving way, and is not dogmatically hypostasized. But this personification shows that the Wisdom of God is not quiescent, but ever before the world, and active. It is described as a cosmical, objective principle, and as a creature of God which is active and operative in the divine works, in the same way as wisdom is valued among men. But beyond all this it must be observed, that according to Solomon, Wisdom, as the creating, upholding, and governing principle in eternal salvation, embraces in itself all the revelation of God; and as the attributes, wisdom and power, understanding and might, justice, holiness and goodness briefly comprehend every other quality of God, so exists the moral unity of the divine nature.

The personification of Solomon had a most significant influence upon a farther unfolding of the idea of God. It became the stereotyped model for similar representations; the beginning-point and the thesis of the later dogmatic discussions. Two things must here be noticed. First, when we compare the representation of the Wisdom of God by Solomon, with the doctrines of the Old Testament respecting the Spirit and the Word of God, we find that what is there predicted of the Spirit and Wisdom of God, is here connected with the idea of the divine Wisdom. The allusion to the Mosaic representation is unmistakable, though there is no mention of the Word and the Spirit. By this harmony, the wisdom of Solomon appears as the nearer attributive designation, as the ethical idea and the essence of the creative and governing Word of God. In history the latter more perfect coalescing of both methods of thought is more easily explained. Secondly, why did the Jew unite the nature and revelation of God under the idea of wisdom, and let them remain there? Love excepted, wisdom is the germ of every quality of God, as viewed from the monotheistic stand-

ing point. Omnipotence, omniscience, eternity and omnipresence fill with astonishment; righteousness and holiness, with fear and reverence. The principal harmony of the divine revelation is still enclosed in these attributes, and the spiritual image of man is still dark. In Wisdom, for the first time, both come in, to perfect the idea.

Yet besides this, there exists a higher idea, nay, the highest. This is the last declaration—God is love—or rather, love is the full idea of his nature—the basis and deepest unity of all his qualities. But to this perfect conception, the Hebrew could not elevate himself, since the perfect revelation of the divine mercy which redeems, and which first appeared in Christ, was, in the Old Testament, only expected and promised. The Hebrew, therefore, though aware of the benevolence and goodness of the divine Wisdom, could not go beyond the wisdom and perfect the idea, because he was ignorant of its prime basis, love.

II.

The germinating principle and first development of theological opinions concerning the Logos cannot be mistaken. Their next farther development we find in the Greek Apocrypha of the Old Testament. Here lies the transition point to the Alexandrian notion of Philo. Two books come before us; that of Jesus Sirach, and the Wisdom of Solomon.

§ 1. Jesus Sirach, the older book, the apocryphal copy of the Proverbs of Solomon, was originally planned and written in Hebrew. He combines, in his principal picture, chap. 1 and 24, the Wisdom of God immediately with the doctrine of Wisdom by Solomon, and describes to us the progressive tradition of the same among the Palestinian Jews. Chap. 1: 1—10 declares that all wisdom is from God, and is with him in eternity. This inscrutable wisdom is created before all things. The All-Wise God has created, known and explored it, or rather poured it out over all his works and all flesh, and has granted it to those who love him according to each one's gifts, verse 6. To whom was the secret of Wisdom unveiled? Thereupon it is answered according to the usual text, v. 5. The fountain of wisdom is the Word of God, and its path the eternal commandments. This en-

ture verse, however, is supposed to be a later addition. There is also in the 24th chapter, a striking similarity between Wisdom and the Word of God. She says respecting herself—24: 3 seq., that she came forth in the beginning of things from the mouth of the Most High. She came forth from God with the world—a creating word—before him, from the beginning. She comprehends and rules heaven and earth, and has her dominions over all people and nations, 24: 16. She seeks a quiet and abiding dominion. God commands her to dwell in Jacob, and to have her possessions in Israel. She serves before God in the holy dwelling place, keeps upon Zion her habitation, and has her government in Jerusalem. v. 10, 11. Here, planted among the people of God, she groweth before them as a cedar of Lebanon; as a living, thriving vine, and her blossoms bear rich and princely fruit. And as the law of God among the Jewish people is the perfection of all wisdom, so it is according to Sirach in this law, the book of books—an endless stream of divine revelation, pouring forth learning, and wisdom, and knowledge, and love for all mankind.

The description, however, includes nothing which points to another fountain, as the natural internal progress of the Hebraistic mind in the use of wisdom. We find in it no hypostasizing of the Divine Wisdom. The allegory, the drapery of the description, affords us only an appearance of it. But this fact is very evident, that the view of Sirach combined the divine and human wisdom as type and prototype—the first as especially something in the world—as the objective revealer of God, and as the creator, upholder and governor of the world. As he continually finds the concentration of this revelation of wisdom, the chief point of interest among the Jews, in the theocratic books (*διαθήκη*), in the *δόξα θεοῦ*, in the tabernacle, in the temple and in the divine law, so he comprises under the *σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ* every thing which is elsewhere said in the Old Testament respecting the *πνεῦμα* and the *λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*. In this way is the Wisdom of God always treated among the Jews, as the objective idea of all revelation, and as the ethical ground and union of it. By steps similar to Sirach's, chap. 24, the idea of Wisdom stands forth in the original Greek, and the later book of Baruch. God, it says, has wisdom. He alone knows it.

To Jacob it was given. By it God has appeared upon the earth, and walked among men, i. e. in the eternal law.

§ 2. The Alexandrian Jewish writing, the Wisdom of Solomon, differs in its representation in many respects. It appears to have been written about a century before Christ. Possibly the author of it, as chap. 16 : 26—29 leads us to think, belonged to the Egyptian Therapeutæ. Throughout, it is a connected eulogy of Wisdom. The eulogized king of Wisdom, Solomon, exhorts the rulers of the earth to true monotheistic wisdom; paints it according to its worth and nature, as compared with heathen ignorance; gives examples concerning the manner of attaining to it; how Wisdom, as the upholding, delivering and benevolent power of the world has especially proved itself in the history of the people of God, and how ignorance, particularly an ignorance of the true worship of God, leads to destruction and condemnation. The method of the work reminds one of the Proverbs of Solomon; but the contents and spirit of it are essentially different.

For our purpose chaps. 6 : 22, to chap. 9 are particularly worthy of consideration. In the preface Solomon says he wishes to make known what wisdom is, and how it is obtained. Accordingly he describes it as the highest good, as the sum and substance of all knowledge, understanding and intellectual attainment. It is a gift of God, which is shared by the pious only, and by them in accordance with their true prayer. In chap. 7 : 22 seq., he describes the notion of it in the following way: It is the sum of all knowledge and understanding; for by it exists an understanding, holy spirit. This spirit is manifold, refined, clear and inviolable. It is the chief good, the creative, omnipotent, merciful, fixed, infallible, happy, almighty, omniscient, omnipresent, pure, exalted and consuming spirit. Wisdom is more active than all activity. It goes forth and pierces through every thing by virtue of its purity. It is the breath of the power of God, and a pure efflux of the divine majesty and government. Therefore no impurity can be mingled with it. It is a resplendence of the Eternal Light, and a reflecting mirror of the activity and goodness of God. It is a unit, and yet may be a complexity—immutable, yet always new, and from generation to generation passing over holy

souls, it creates friends and prophets of God. God loves no one else as he loves him who dwells with Wisdom. It is more brilliant than the sun, and has its throne above the stars. Compared with light, it is much superior; for after light follows darkness, but to Wisdom belongs no darkness. It rules from one end of the world to the other, and governs well.

Wisdom is here described as a holy spirit of light, proceeding from God and piercing through all things. In its notion, it is spirit, free from matter. It shares in every attribute of the divine character; or rather, every quality of God is comprised in it. It is the governing principle in all the works of God—the divine organ for creating, upholding and regulating the world. In this sense, the writer calls it the *πάρεδρον* of the divine throne, which was present when he created the world,—3: 4, 9. The author indeed does not say this explicitly; but throughout the description we are compelled to infer that, like J. Sirach, he conceives of wisdom as coming forth from God before the creation of the world. In particular places, he parallelizes it with the divine Logos,—9: 1, 2; 16: 12; Ps. 107: 20; but in such a way, that the Logos especially signifies the revealed form of the divine power and wisdom, the ethical principle of the world. It is particularly worthy of notice that the *παντοδύναμος λόγος* 18: 15, 16, which put to death the first-born of the Egyptians, is represented as an angel, who leaving heaven, goes forth upon the earth to put an end to death and destruction. Compare Chron. 21: 15, 16. This Logos, also, the divine castigator, by poetical language is described as an angel. With regard to the *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, wisdom is represented not merely as a parallelism, but as something identical 1: 4—7; 7: 22; 9: 17; 7: 7; 12: 1. A question may naturally arise, whether, in the word *σοφία*, a self-existent personal distinction out of God, is presented to us, an hypostasis; and if so, to what extent; or only a poetically feigned person? The course of thought from chaps. 8: 2; 9: 18, suggests, with little exception, a mere poetical personification of wisdom. Solomon seeks wisdom; he chooses it for the bride of his youth, his counsellor and his consolation. He finds by intercourse with it, immortality, serenity, joy, riches and glory. Here it is very evidently represented and personi-

fied as a necessary, cardinal virtue. But in chaps. 6: 9. —7: 22, the other representation, i. e. the representation of Proverbs, predominates.

But when we advance from chap. 10: 1, where the providential Wisdom, as comprehending the divine power, love and holiness, is portrayed in the history of the Jews, Wisdom is frequently interchanged with the subject, ὁ σοφίος, and the idea is more fixed than a mere poetic personification. In the author's view, Wisdom is the perfect revelation of God in the world. This is also apparent in Jesus Sirach. But in chap. 7: 22, undeniably the writer goes farther. Wisdom becomes an emanative reflection of God as a holy spirit, a living, active type of God in the world; in short, a kind of Platonic soul of the world; for Wisdom is here more than the Platonic soul-substance of the world. But according to this connection, it is the real, eternal, divine principle of the world, the particular medium between God and the world. Yet the author is quite removed from a decided hypostasizing of Wisdom under the aspect of a self-existent, personal essence. Respecting the Logos of Philo as a δευτερος θεός, he has not perfected his opinion. The idea of the divine attributes and the ancient mode of thinking still work too strongly with him. But the near approach to Philo is unmistakable. The book appears to be a combination of the Jewish theology, in which a peculiar mingling of the former revealed doctrine among the Alexandrian Jews, with the oriental, Greek, religious philosophy or Gnosis, has already begun to exist.

III.

The marked historical origin of this intermingling lies in the Babylonian exile. It was natural that the Jews should assimilate the religion of a foreign land with their own. It was at this time, undoubtedly, that the reformation by Zoroaster and the active Sabaismus effected its affinity with the Mosaic religion. And in this way the influx of the doctrine of Zoroaster into the mode of religious thought was inevitable. It gives definiteness to the view, perhaps, to say that there existed in and since the time of the exile, not only a mixed religious method of thought among the Jews, which seeks to combine and harmonize a native and a foreign religion, the one enlarged

and illuminated by the other, but that out of it sprang a religio-philosophic tendency, which strove for a common religious thought, and thereby a religious speculation concerning the positive and the variable in religion.

It is enough for our purpose that there was developed from this theological transition period—B. C. perhaps 700 to 400—a clearer idea and a more enlarged signification concerning the angel-doctrine* of the Jewish faith. The higher spirit-world became increasingly necessary, as a medium between the ethical nature of God and the physical world. Consequently, at this time, the doctrine respecting the divine creative Word, was described according to the Zoroastrian idea of the Honover, and received a speculative religious meaning. This last appeared in the Egyptian period which followed the Persian, and afterwards in the Alexandrian and Hellenistic. It is also known that a large body of Jews were collected in Egypt, particularly in Alexandria during the reign of the Ptolemies, and that they received a strong bias to Greco-Egyptian culture and literature. This culture was a mixture of Greek and oriental philosophy. Its essential element is the oriental religious philosophy or Gnosis. Even in this last notion, the Jews took a prominent part, and thus formed the Jewish Alexandrian religious philosophy or Gnosis.

We pass by the earlier traces of the Gnosis, scattered over the Alexandrian translation of the Old Testament. The appearance of it is evident in the fragments of Aristobulus, who flourished about 200 B. C. He wrote a Gnostic allegorical interpretation of the Mosaic writings—*ἡ τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων ἐρμηνεία*, or *ἐξηγήσεις τῆς Μωσέως γραφῆς*. We quote the fragment concerning the creation of the world. "Since our life is full of hardship, God, who created the world, appointed the seventh day for rest. This day in a *φυσίως*, i. e. in a metaphysical sense can be called the first generation of light, in which every thing is seen comprehensively. But one might say this also concerning Wisdom; for all light proceeds out of it; and some of the Peripatetic school have said concerning it, 'it has the property (*τάξις*) of a torch—for he who follows it will henceforth enjoy uninterrupted rest.' But

* See Hengstenberg's *Christology*, Vol. I, pp. 161—187.

more plainly and clearly does our predecessor Solomon say, 'It existed before heaven and earth.'"

As far as the fragment has stated the unity of the doctrine, Aristobulus seems to have identified Wisdom with a power anterior to the creation, in the same manner with the author of the book of Wisdom. Here and there the distinction between the hidden and revealed God is brought out. But concerning his opinion of the Logos, the fragment leaves us in uncertainty.

A full and clear account of the Alexandrian Jewish Gnosis, as it had been developed at the time of Christ and the apostles, is given us by Philo. But we should be very much deceived, if, in consequence of the fulness in which the Jewish Gnosis is unfolded, we should expect to find a comprehensive and perfectly harmonious system. It does not appear that either Philo or the spirit of the times was directed to that point. Indeed, a mingling of the revelation to the Hebrews, with the oriental theosophy and Hellenistic learning culled out of the various schools, Platonic, Aristotelean, Stoical and Pythagorean, could not be subsidized even by the strongest and most active mind into a living, theological or philosophic system.

The partial contemporaneousness of Philo with the apostle John, (he flourished A. D. 40, or 50,) causes us to anticipate from Philo's representation the most intimate historical connection; since the Evangelist's doctrine of the Logos harmonizes with the time of the Jewish Gnosis. But in order that the relations of time and similarity may not blind us to an essential difference of essence, it is necessary briefly to describe the doctrine of the Logos as held by Philo, in its connection with the nature of God and his connection with the world. According to Philo, God—ὁ ὄντως θεός, ὁ εἰς ὄντως ὢν θεός, ὁ ἀληθεία θεός,—is the absolute perfectibility, universality and simplicity of existence, the mere essence, without attribute and without name. In his essence he is incomprehensible and concealed;—absolutely perfect in himself, without relation to any thing else whatever—the τὸ ὄν—spirit. Externally and with reference to the world, he holds relations; but so far as this is the case, the idea is material. He is the absolute cause of all that is. But so far as the appearance of created matter bears a relation to its

substratum, God is wholly unchangeable and perfect; having with it no immediate contact, neither creating, forming, giving it life, nor upholding nor governing it.

But how, then, can God be the cause of all things, Creator and Lord? He is mediately known and revealed in the world by his *powers*—*δύναμεις*. These, differing both from the absolute essence of God, and from the material world, are the necessary media of God's power and activity. Without them, there can be no just conception of God. With regard to their province in the universe, God may be said to rule the world as the highest Reason, as a king surrounded by his subjects. They are as innumerable and various as the stars or the angels. Plato calls them *ideas*—the types, patterns, real principles of all things, the *κόσμος νοητός*, the immaterial, original world itself, the antitype of the sensuous, material world. Moreover, these powers have their orders and classes. Generally Philo distinguishes between the two, the highest and most eminent powers, (a fact of primary importance,) viz. the benevolent or creative, and the royal, or the punitive and corrective. The first, he says, is called in the Scriptures God—*θεός*, and the second Lord—*κύριος*. As God in nature is one, so he thinks these powers, divided into innumerable classes and gradations, appear in the world as essentially one—(what the Stoic would call *λόγος σπερματικός*)—not simply so far as all the powers of God are one, but also objectively and per se. This unity lies in the idea of the divine Logos, as that in which all the divine powers are connected together and graduated, both as it concerns their immanence in God, and their communication with the world.

The Mosaic history may have formed the germ to this course of thought; but its more certain conception owes its origin to the Hellenistic philosophy and the oriental theosophic Gnosis. As Philo, in his discussion concerning the relation of God to the world, proceeded according to the Hellenistic idea of the world, and this in accordance with Plato's doctrine of ideas, embracing the Hellenistic physics and uniting the Hebraistic account of the creation to the doctrine of emanations; so also he joins to this philosophic relation of God to the world the Hebrew idea of Wisdom, while there is but little immediate connection with it. In comparison with this, a more excellent

and a scriptural formula is offered us instead of his Gnosis—the ancient description of the Word and the Word of God. Not only would this be a fitting expression for the unity and multiplicity of the divine power in the world, especially in Greek, *λόγος* and *λόγοι*, but in ambiguity concerning reason and word, it would be admissible to use the idea of the divine powers in the world, both as immanent and emanent.

But while Philo in his way loved the most ancient basis of faith in his Gnosis, and sought to reduce his Gnostic ideas to the Old Testament representation and mode of thought, the mixed manner of speech remained; so that, as a Platonist, he called the divine powers, ideas; and as a Jewish writer, *ἄγγελοι*, angels, and exchanged these modes of expression with one another, as suited his pleasure.

We will explain his doctrine of the Logos somewhat more accurately. According to the two-fold idea of the word *ὁ λόγος*, thought and language, reason and word, and, according to the analogy of the human *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*, the internal word or the unexpressed thought, and of the human *λόγος προφορικὸς*, the external word or the expressed thought, Philo employs the idea of the *θεῶς λόγος* or *λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ* in a two-fold signification; and thereby distinguishes between the relation of the Logos, as he is immanent in God, the divine understanding, the divine thought, and the relation of the same so far as he is expressed as the Word of God, appearing and acting in the world. The pure immanent *λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ* or divine *νοῦς* is as inconceivable and incomprehensible by man as God himself; and although by abstraction different, yet as to essence, one with God. But Philo does not adhere to this abstract predicative and attributive apprehension of the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*. The *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* has for its essence, indeed possesses in itself the idea of ideas—the *ἀρχέτυπος ἰδέα*, the archetypical world which exists in God as a reality, before any external creation or arrangement in the material world. By this activity, is made perfect as an eternal power in God himself, that *ἐννόησις*, the *λογισμὸς θεοῦ λογιζομένου*. But even as an activity of God, as a creative power, the Logos is necessarily also *προφορικὸς*, i. e. as the creating, constructing activity of

God, he goes forth from God as the expressed Word. So the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος is revealed in the world by the Word of God, and is as λόγος λεγόμενος, the ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ according to the ancient mode of speech, and is conceivable and comprehensible by men. But as this is only the established relation of the divine Logos to the actual world, so the λόγος προφορικός is only the product of the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος. This is the fountain of that, and is equally and essentially one with it, (ὁ γὰρ θεὸς λέγων ἅμα ἐποίει.) Thus it is the house of the immanent Logos, as the word is essentially the house of the thought—i. e. the form of its development.

Every living, active relation of God to the world, and every objective development of himself therein, is comprehended in the λόγος προφορικός. He is the τομεύς πάντων, artificer of all things—the *mensura universorum*, so far as the idea of place gives every thing its bound and relation. Thus the Logos constructs or creates the world, inasmuch as he imprints himself upon the matter as a divine seal, or gives it a cosmical ideal form. And as he has created the world, or in other words, God by him, so he upholds it. He is the indwelling, overruling power of the world; its divine foundation and bond; and so far as it is preserved by him, he being the connecting link and regulator of the divine ideas or powers of the world, he is its Eternal Law. But he is not the central power of all things, as a mere formal, external law, but is full of light and love, filling every thing with light and love, ordaining and directing every thing with divine wisdom, love, righteousness and holiness. Thus he penetrates, animates, guides and conducts the world as a divine providence, and is in external nature a necessary instrument; but in humanity he is the indwelling divine power, the pure understanding, the conscience, the bestower of wisdom and guardian of virtue. So far as Wisdom is regarded as ruling the world, as virtue proceeding from him, it signifies the Wisdom of God. Also with regard to the Spirit, the Holy Spirit in its objective appearance in the world, it is one and the same. At times it unites the world as a peculiar spirit; at times it spiritualizes and renovates man, especially as a prophetic spirit.

The Logos of Philo is the oldest creation of God. He is not unbegotten as God, nor has an end as a created

being. He is the oldest son of the eternal Father—*ο πρεσβύτατος υἱὸς θεοῦ, ὁ προτόγονος*—the image of God, the creator of the world, the revered name of God, the medium between God and the world, both distinct from God and united to him, the highest angel, the second God,—*ὁ δεύτερος θεός*,—the high priest, the reconciler and mediator of the world and of mankind, particularly manifest by visible representations in the history of the Jewish people, so that all divine visions and revelations in the Scriptures may be conducted back to this Logos. With a more extensive and more comprehensive Biblical view before him, and in consequence of the interchangeableness and intermingling of the positive teachings of the Old Testament with the Judæo-Gnostic elements, one can with difficulty decide whether or not Philo has taught that the divine Logos is a true real person—an hypostasis of God. So long as we abide by a single representation, we remain in doubt; but the more we enter into the internal harmony of Philo's religious and philosophic system, the more decidedly we can answer the question in the affirmative. A part of Philo's personification of the Logos is purely allegorical and typical, and adapted only to the Biblical view and the Biblical representation. This fact is against hypostasizing the Logos. To this part, we refer the description of the Logos as high priest, etc., *ἀρχιερεὺς, παράκλητος, δέσμος, σφραγίς*. Still he uses poetical personification, evidently in accordance with his own method of thought, to describe rather the idea, than the type of a person which dwelt in his soul. Indeed the analogy he draws between the divine Logos and the human soul, with its relations, virtues and attributes, differs but little from an hypostasis of the Logos; for, irrespective of every thing else, he does not consider the human to be a perfectly adequate representation of the divine.

In accordance with the difference of the relations to God, Philo discusses the divine Logos in a two-fold manner, the immanent and the emanent. The more the immanent and attributive character of the Logos develops itself, the more appears the difference between the Logos and the divine unity, and thereby is seen the self-existent personality of the Logos, without any solution of the difficulty. But when the emanent, living activity of the Logos is presented to view, then appears also the distinction

of the Logos and God, and what Philo certainly teaches, the real self-existence and personality of the Logos. And indeed that Philo has taught that the λόγος προφορικός, and mediately from this, the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος is an active existence, differing from God, and yet a dependent hypostasis of the same, appears true for the following reasons: First, Philo repeatedly calls the Logos the archangel—ἀρχάγγελος. Now, according to the Jewish theology of the time, the angel was a personal nature, distinct from God. Therefore the Logos, as the highest angel, must have had a personal character. But besides this, he calls the Logos, in the fragments mentioned by Eusebius, τὸν δεύτερον θεόν, and separates from it the one before the Logos, τὸν πρὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, or God above the Logos, ὑπὲρ τὸν λόγον θεόν or the supreme Father of all—τὸν ἀνωτάτω καὶ πατέρα τῶν ὅλων. He wishes to explain in what sense God, in Gen. 1: 27, says, "in the image of God, made he man," as concerning another God, when he says, "very beautifully and wisely is this expressed; for no mortal can resemble the highest God and Father of all things, but he can imitate the second God, who is the Logos of the first;" when he uses such language, the idea becomes fixed, and the position he establishes is produced from his religious philosophy. The manner of treatment arises from the principles of Philo's doctrine. But the strongest expression for us is the second God. This argues a real divine personality,* both according to the polytheistic and monotheistic usage. That the term second appears so seldom is explained from the undue prominence it would give to the polytheistic view. And it must be remembered, he employs his strong monotheistic expression, "There is one true God," as infrequently. And indeed in his doctrine of angels, in the more real gradation there maintained, the divine personality is frequently mentioned. Evidently, if Philo had been a pantheist, this argument would have no force. But he was a Dualist. He maintained that the material world and the divine nature were created from each other. As a strong Jewish monotheist, he expressly says, the Logos is called

* Our author, undoubtedly, interprets Philo too much in accordance with his own wishes. The idea of a personal Logos cannot be fairly established from a complete view of Philo's philosophic system.

δεύτερος θεός only in a peculiar sense—ἐν καταχρησῇ. The other names of the Logos, Son of God, first-begotten, the man of God, are certainly in part figurative expressions; yet they have some truth with them, who place in the δεύτερος θεός the idea of a personal essence distinct from God. Still he considers the world, so far as there is the expression and manifestation of the divine idea, to be a living essence—the son of God.

Finally, though Philo endeavors to exclude the opposition between God and the world, by distinguishing the God unbegotten from the God revealed, yet this difference which he makes must have as much reality as that opposition. Moreover, he makes the absolute self-existence of God really distinct; and the Logos, as mediating between God and the world, a being corresponding to the absolute divine being, and yet a kind of secondary type of him. Therefore he must have conceived of the Logos as a real personal existence. The harmony of the system agrees when we consider a single explanation, that to his mind the Logos was an hypostasis different from God, and that he was the medium power, possessing in himself the divine attributes, and revealing them to the world. Philo was an Emanatist. But the emanation which he taught, was the efflux of the original divine essence in the modified form of substantial, personal life. The divine Logos possessed in itself the highest and first position.

But the question now arises, whether, as having any bearing upon the prologue of John, Philo had fixed the idea of the Logos in any connection with the Messiahship?

The Jewish expectations respecting the Messiah were not unknown to him. He cherishes for it a peculiar predilection, and discusses it in his usually interesting and complete way. For instance, when he speaks of the coming of the holy Messiah, and describes the return of the Jews from the captivity into the land of promise, he says, they shall be conducted by a divine, superhuman appearance (ὁψις), which, unseen by others, is visible to those who are to be delivered. From this appearance, however, he distinguishes the Messianic Prince, the Saviour who is to make war upon the heathen after the return, and conquer and rule his people in righteousness. This last idea appears to be entirely according to the pos-

itive ancient theology of Philo, and stands in no connection with his doctrine of the Logos. But elsewhere, when he describes the guidance of the Jews from the beginning, he appears to have conceived of the Logos as that which was present in the heavenly vision, the ἀφανὴς ἄγγελος, the concealed angel in the pillar of cloud and the pillar of fire. This appearance was somewhat Messianic. Accordingly he represents every where the idea of the Logos in Messianic drapery, but under the influence of his Gnostic opinions, he could not perfectly form the incarnation of a Messianic Logos.

IV.

So far as it belongs to the historical basis of John's prologue, the development of the Alexandrian Jewish doctrine of the Wisdom and the Word is established by Philo. But he both represents the Alexandrian and also particularly the Hellenistic Jewish Gnosis of his time. Alexandria was the centre of the Hellenistic Judaism. Respecting the spread of Alexandrian Jewish Gnosis among the Jews at this time, Apollos and Cerinthus give us explicit examples. Both appeared at Ephesus. The first, as Luke 18: 24 clearly shows, came out of Alexandria, and circulated among the Jews at Ephesus, Alexandrian learning. The second, as proved by the assertions of one of a later period, often having been in Egypt, came to Ephesus, and maintained there his philosophic notions. Accordingly by the aid of Philo, we can now immediately pass over to the doctrine of the Logos, which more intimately harmonizes with that taught by the apostle to the Ephesians. It is uncertain whether John originally or immediately found his doctrine in accordance with the Alexandrian Gnosis. Very evidently "the Introduction" has established the beginning and foundation of the Christian doctrine of the Logos before the time of John; the apostle Paul thinks and teaches respecting Christ in the Jewish Gnostic way. The Jewish Gnosis explains his doctrine concerning the first and the second Adam. But Paul received his Jewish Gnostic ideas from the Palestinian schools; for no doubt can be entertained that a Jewish Gnosis existed in Palestine, and had entered into Christianity before the time of John.

With every effort that can be made for solving the

question, as to the foreign introduction of this doctrine, after the time of Nehemiah or the Maccabees, Chaldæism would be admitted through this channel. Still the Palestinian Judaism could neither be produced from the exile, nor with the existing national prejudice, and with the opposition to the influx of Alexandrianism and especially Hellenism, could it be avoided.

The two Chaldaic paraphrases, that of Onkelos upon the Pentateuch, and somewhat later, that of Jonathan Ben Uzziel upon the prophets, were written at a period later than that of the apostles. In both alike, as in the Alexandrian translation, we discover a Gnostic tendency to represent all the creations and activities of God revealing himself in the world, by divine, mediate powers.

These appearances are proved also from the powerful influx of Chaldaism. It alone is sufficient for evidence that the Alexandrian, Jewish Gnosis had entered and spread among the inhabitants of Palestine. Again, the union of the Palestinian Essenes with the Egyptian Therapeutæ is undeniable; and by it was established a certain admission of the Alexandrian Gnosis. It is also worthy of consideration that one can easily discover the entrance of Greek learning after the middle of the year 200 B. C. The Rabbins represent Gamaliel, Paul's teacher, as an active promoter of Greek literature in the Greek schools. There was at Jerusalem a synagogue of Alexandrian and Cyrenian Jews. The admission of those foreigners was inevitable, and Josephus himself was not able to exclude the Alexandrian influence.

Now, in the proportion to which the Gnostic method of thought was spread through Judaism, in and out of Palestine, Christianity would also suffer by its effect upon the imaginative Jews. Indeed in the beginning of the gospel, in Christ himself, we find no trace of it. Christ and his doctrine depended upon the providential preparation of the entire world for Christian salvation; but in connection with it was the Gnostic tendency. Christianity and Judaism are to be separated from each other. The former can never be developed from the latter. Indeed Christianity is the complete satisfaction of that deep, inbred, religious craving of our nature. Only so far as the doctrinal development of Christianity commenced among the Jews was the entrance of Jewish Gnosis inevitable. The

apostle Paul created out of the Christian principle of life the peculiarity of Christianity, at a very early period. But his doctrine stood very much exposed to the influence of Palestinian Gnosis.

If now we compare the doctrine of Philo, and the Palestinian, with the prologue of John concerning the Word, we shall have, concerning the Palestinian Gnosis, no other documents than the above mentioned Chaldaic paraphrases. But in these we find, that the revelation and presence of God more or less visibly in the world, are often described in the Old Testament in a Biblical and general sense; instead of the name or person of God, the angel of the Lord is mentioned, or the glory of the Lord, or the Shechina, or finally, the Word of the Lord. This appears so unexpectedly and strikingly, that a dogmatic reason must have lain at the basis of it. Especially is the MEMRA so strongly personified that no one can doubt that the Paraphrasts understood by it, as also by the Shechina, a divine hypostasis and divine emanation according to the doctrine of Philo's Logos.

How still later the doctrine of the Logos was farther developed in the Jewish Cabbala, is well known. But it is not the fault of our authority, that we cannot find in the Palestinian Gnosis of the time of Jesus, the doctrine of the divine Word as widely diffused and as clearly unfolded. The idea of systematizing particularly appears to have a later origin, and is first treated of under the retrospective influence of Christianity.

We cannot with certainty point out whether, and if so how, the Palestinian theology at the time of Jesus and the apostles, had applied the doctrine of the hypostatic Word to the idea of the Messiah. We discover at the time of Christ, a more popular political theocracy, and a more learned ideal Jewish representation of the Messiah. Certainly the apostle Paul held views like the later Jews. But according to Paul's opinion, the Palestinian Gnosis, the ideal historical view concerning the nature of the Messiah, appears more in harmony with the character of the Son of God, or the second heavenly Adam, than according to Philo's idea of the divine Word. It is evident that Paul and the other apostles first came by faith in the historical Christ, to the full Christian idea of the eternal Son of God. The Jewish schools of that day fur-

nished the preparative and fragmentary elements. But the peculiar metaphysical theology respecting the person of Christ, lay not at the door of the Christian faith. When Paul says, Col. 1: 16, 17, "God has made the world by his Son," the existing Gnostic doctrine concerning the creating Word shared in the description. If Paul and his teacher Gamaliel had only determined upon the idea of the Logos, and associated it with the Messiahship of the Son of God, it is evident that they must have come to John's formula, that the eternal Logos existed in the man Christ Jesus. How near was he to it? Phil. 2: 6.

If now we would discover the traces of the doctrine of the Logos as held by the Jewish Gnostics, in its relation to the doctrine respecting the person of Christ in the New Testament and out of it, and before the time of John, the epistle to the Hebrews, for various reasons, demands our attention. If this book was not written by Apollos, still it bears undeniable marks of the Alexandrian mind and Alexandrian Gnosis. Here the doctrine concerning the Word of God is already associated with the idea of the Messiah, as the Son of God, in the historical sense, in one sense as held by Paul, and in another as maintained by John. God has, vs. 1, 2, 3, by the Son, the image of his nature, the reflection of his person, created the world, and he, i. e. the preëxistent Son, does every thing by the word of his, i. e. Son's mouth. To the Son is accredited, so far as he upholds the world, the divine power of command, *q̄h̄ua*, the creative word as the organ; but he is not called as by John, the eternal personal Logos. So that the verses of the epistle are removed still farther from the formula of John, *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*, the Word became flesh, and cannot be the resultant of Philo's Logos doctrine, but must have originated from the Palestinian mode of thought.

From the idea of the preëxistent creative Son of God, which we find in Paul and the epistle to the Hebrews, we can easily understand how John could come to his subject with a more enlarged conception of the Christian Gnosis, viz.: that the only begotten Son of God is the incarnate, eternal, personal Logos. John, however, comprehends under the idea of the only begotten Son of God, a being preëxistent, as Paul and the verses in the Epistle

to the Hebrews do. In the historical account of him, he employs no other method of description. The Son of God is sent by the Father, descended from heaven, but was from the beginning with the Father in divine glory. But as it is difficult and troublesome to conceive of the Son of God both as an historical subject and a preëxistence, one must take into consideration the progress of Christian thought in its connection with Jewish Gnosis, and that John describes the antemundane Son of God as the world-creating, world-sustaining, and enlightening personal *Lógos*, and that this *Logos* in humanity became the Son of God.

If this process of thought had taken a natural course, the immediate historical connection between John's doctrine of the *Logos* and the perfected Alexandrian notion would necessarily appear. No earlier and no other representation of the idea of the *Logos* offers so full an explanation, and one so perfectly harmonious with the standing-point of John as Philo's. The argument employed by him in the first five positions of the Introduction, extends itself to the manner of expression, so that every one can determine it from his immediate influence. One must also admit, though it appear severe, that Philo's representation is the original one, and that the perfected Gnostic doctrine of the *Logos* at Alexandria is established with certain positions and expressions which were used by all in a manner essentially similar.

As we explain, by these later definitions, John's doctrine of the *Logos* from its relation to Philo's, we are able also to explain the historical position, that John like Philo understood the personal hypostasis of the divine Word, as in its nature substantially one with Wisdom, or rather the light of the world, the divine power whereby God reveals himself as creating, upholding and enlightening the world.

Respecting this *Logos* John would say, that he does not begin with the historical Christ, as the temporal Word of God, of which Christ spoke when on earth, nor with a *Logos* developed from the created world, but with one eternal before the world, who was with God, and who was God—*πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*. This opinion is also maintained briefly by Philo, as appears from a more complete knowledge of his method of thought, wherein

the Logos differs internally from the divine subject of the Monos, and even by a self-existent distinction out of God; but has in other respects such an internal union with the divine nature that it can be called the pure image, the perfect glory of God, in a certain sense, *θεός λόγος, ὁ δευτερός θεός.*

Like Philo, John considers the Logos preëminently in his revealed relation to the world. Accordingly he represents the creation of the world by the Logos in the same way with Philo, so that the Logos is considered as the necessary medium of it. And in fact, what Philo says of the Logos as the fountain of all life in the world, the dispenser of light, the wisdom and guide of men, John says briefly, *ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἣν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων.*

But John's doctrine of the Logos is essentially Christian, and in this respect differs entirely from that of Philo. Philo's at its root is dualistic, John's monotheistic. According to Philo, the personality of God in connection with the Logos is excluded; and the revealed God is in itself a predicative and nameless (pantheistic) substance. But John maintains from the beginning that God is the eternal personal love. The hypostasis with him, has also a very different signification. Verse 3 shows a significant difference. In this verse, John declares with the strongest energy, that without the Logos nothing exists which does exist, and appears to place himself in direct opposition to the Jewish Gnosis. We do not believe that Philo would have acknowledged the validity of John's position. Against it would have been John's protestation. And this is a peculiar element of positive Biblical revelation, which produces the cause of the creation out of nothing; so that one can truly say that John goes back again to the Old Testament and purer doctrine concerning the creation of the world by the Word and Wisdom.

Hence appears perhaps another distinction which is seen in the fifth verse, inasmuch as the darkness which does not comprehend the divine light is a pure ethical relation; whereas with Philo, the relation between darkness and light has a physical basis, and also a necessary connection between the spirituality of God and the opaqueness of the *ἔλγ.* The idea that the Logos would destroy the sins of men is foreign to Philo.

But the most characteristic difference is that John maintains that the substantial Word of God in Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, became man and truly lived among men. This excludes the Docetish principles of Philo's Gnosis, and brings out the doctrine of the Logos as the basis of the Christian faith, in the real connection of God and man in the perfect divine resemblance of mankind. Such an application of the idea of the Logos to the Messiahship, very evidently was impossible both to Philo and all those who had received the Docetish principles of the Alexandrian Gnosis. When Philo calls the Logos, 'ὁ ἀληθής or ἀληθινός ἄνθρωπος, 'ὁ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἄνθρωπος or 'ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος, or ἄνθρωπος θεός, or οὐρανοῦ, expressions indicating the humanity of the Logos, the idea differs from the expression of John, ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο; inasmuch as Philo says expressly, "the heavenly ἄνθρωπος who is in the image of God, does not partake of mortality, and is not of an earthly nature." There is, according to Philo, no immediate image of God in the race of Adam; whereas, according to John, the Logos made a true appearance, in active, temporal humanity. The appearance of the Logos before treated of in history, was only a symbolical idea in visions and dreams. It was continually changing. It was partly angelic and partly human. This difference between Philo and John arises naturally from the Christian faith. And that John has presented the truth so prominently has its cause in the anti-Gnostic tendency of the entire gospel. But this is to be charged not immediately to Philo, and the Jewish Alexandrian Gnosis, but, as we have already said, to the pseudo-Gnostic tendency in the Christian community.

O. A. S.

ARTICLE IV.

INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

Dick's Lectures. Inspiration. Vol. I. Page 113.

Buck's Theological Dictionary. Article on Inspiration.

The Bible is regarded in Christian countries as the word of God. Accustomed to hear it spoken of as such, we grow up under the impression that it is divine. This impression, however, is often vague and undefined. There are very many who can render no very definite reasons for believing the Scripture to be inspired, and a still greater number who have no clear ideas as to what constitutes inspiration. Such therefore as have not a heartfelt love for the Bible, and cannot feel evidence which they are not able to describe, are constantly liable to be thrown into doubt by the cavils of sceptics. Treatises upon inspiration are often too subtle and scholastic, or too voluminous to benefit common readers; or they are incorporated in large theological works, accessible only to a few. We need a brief, comprehensive handbook on the subject, adapted to ordinary readers especially;—a work which will answer the question, What constitutes Inspiration? In the following pages, we shall offer some strictures on the theory of Dr. Dick and others, and then propose for consideration our own theory, hoping at least to elicit investigation, and provoke abler pens to furnish for the community a manual on inspiration, adapted to the wants of the times.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," are the words of Paul. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," are the words of Peter. These, and other like declarations, scattered throughout the Bible, are generally regarded as proving the inspiration of the Scriptures.

There is less difficulty in obtaining assent to the fact of inspiration, than in obtaining concurrent views of

what we may understand by the term *inspiration*; and whether that term means precisely the same thing, when applied to different parts of the Bible.

Dr. Dick says, (Vol. I, page 113,) "Inspiration may be defined to be an influence of the Holy Spirit upon the understandings, imaginations, memories and other mental powers of the sacred writers, by which they were qualified to communicate to the world the knowledge of the will of God." He further says, "This definition is designedly made general, that it may comprehend the different degrees of inspiration, which will be afterwards mentioned; and it is so expressed as to suit the highest and the lowest." He then divides inspiration into the following degrees: Superintendence, Elevation, and Suggestion.

Superintendence, in this theory, consists in the care of divine Providence over Moses and others, while they were writing a history of events which occurred under their own observation, which they were competent to describe but were liable to forget, or to make mistakes in exhibiting them, and needed superintendence merely.

Elevation consists in the aid which the Holy Spirit furnished to the writers of some portions, as to their imaginations, their style, languages and metaphors, increasing the vigor, conciseness and beauty of their productions, which might, without this aid, have been equally truthful, but less interesting and attractive.

Suggestion consists in conveying thoughts to the mind of the writers, which they could not have conceived, leaving them at liberty to express them in their own way, except that the Holy Spirit might elevate their minds, and superintend their work to prevent faults. Suggestion or revelation must also include such portions as the Saviour's instructions, which must be regarded as wholly divine, thought, word and style.

The ground on which this division of inspiration is usually defended, is, that it required less of divine influence to write a narrative of events that fell under the eye of the writer, than to write a history, for example, of the creation, thousands of years after it took place; less to copy from public records, as the Chronicles of the kings of Israel and Judah, than to predict future events, or to describe the scenes of the invisible world. Hence the

opinion is adopted that there is only a limited degree of divinity in some portions of the Bible, a greater degree in other portions, and all divinity in the rest. This or a similar theory has been received extensively into favor. It has been supported by great and good men. But the antiquity of error cannot make it truth, nor bind us to dismiss investigation. To these opinions we have several objections.

1. There is not an intimation in the Bible to sustain the opinion that any part of the book is less than divine, wholly divine. It claims inspiration without reserve, and without any modifying or explanatory terms, unless we except a few brief expressions of Paul in his epistles, the boundaries of which he defines. What right, therefore, have we to conclude, that one part of the book was written under a greater degree of divine influence than another, and consequently is more sacred?

2. The adoption of this theory endangers the authority of the Scriptures. One man may select such a portion as he chooses to disregard, and ascribe to it one of the lower degrees of inspiration, and then neglect it with supposed impunity. Another may neglect still another portion, on the same plea. The Swedenborgian denies divinity to the epistles and to many other parts of the Scriptures, because they interfere with a theory which he is interested to sustain. The Socinian culls out such portions as are fatal to his theory, and concludes that they could not have been fully inspired. The Universalist claims the same right; and with this theory of classification the whole Bible may be frittered away piecemeal. For no one can avoid feeling a higher reverence for such parts as are believed to be wholly divine, than for those which only claim a less degree of divine influence. One part would speak with a less authoritative voice than the other; and the tendency of man's depraved spirit would be to degrade those passages which strike most effectually at his heart, and raise the warning voice against his errors and his sins; while those which can be made to speak soothing words to his conscience would be raised to the highest dignity. What error is not believed, or what sin is not tolerated by individuals or sects claiming to be Christian? Let all adopt this theory, and claim their right to classify the Scriptures, assigning to each portion

the degree of divine influence which they are willing to accord to it, and how much of the Bible would be left with an undisputed right to supreme divinity?

3. God would not give us a book whose instructions are of infinite importance to us, but of various degrees of sacredness, without furnishing us the means of knowing what are most divine and authoritative; this would be to leave us, through unavoidable ignorance, to commit fatal errors, reaching in their consequences to eternal ages. No; the Bible claims inspiration. It claims this for every part, and for every part equally. It may be said, in reply, that the advocates of "degrees of inspiration" do not regard one part of the Scriptures as less authoritative than another. Why then use the terms "highest and lowest" degrees of inspiration? The idea in the mind of the writer may have been correct; but he conveys a false idea to his readers. Dr. Dick says, p. 115, "Moses could say, without divine afflatus, that on such a night the Israelites marched out of Egypt;" and Solomon could remark, "A soft answer turneth away wrath, but grievous words stir up anger." It does not concern us to know what Moses or Solomon could say without divine afflatus; but did they record any thing in the Bible without it?

We are confident that there is a theory of inspiration that covers the whole Bible. In exhibiting it we start with the inquiry, Who conceived the plan of the Bible? Did Moses, Joshua, Ezra, David, Isaiah, or Paul "get up" the Bible? Did they probably conceive the design of even the part they wrote? The Bible, were it a human production, would be the greatest miracle on record. No other work of man bears the least analogy to it. Would Moses have taken up his pen as an author to write a history of creation, and then have crowded his whole description of those magnificent events into two short chapters? Would he have summed up the history of our race for 1656 years, in five chapters, which could be read in half an hour? Would he have given in three chapters the history of the awful corruption of our race, which required such a judgment as the deluge? Would he have given in that space, the plan of the ark, an account of the ministerial labors of Noah, the conduct of his hearers, the building of the ark, the gathering of the

various tribes of living creatures into it, their manner of subsistence, the flood, its appearance, its causes and effects, the feelings of mankind when it commenced and as it advanced, its abatement, the going out of the family of Noah, the appearance of the earth, and the division of it among the posterity of Noah,—had he conceived the plan of the books he wrote? Supposing the whole account to be fiction, it only increases our surprise at its brevity. For let any man undertake to write a romance founded upon the incidents of creation, that are barely touched in the Mosaic account, and the space occupied by the whole Pentateuch he would find insufficient. What then would be required for a romance upon all the above topics? No, it is easier to admit the credibility of the narrative than to account for its brevity, supposing it to be fiction; and vastly easier to admit God's authorship of the record than to ascribe it to Moses. The whole book of Genesis defies any rational account of its peculiar form and character, but upon the supposition that the design originated with a mind which took in at a glance the whole scope and design of the Bible as it now is.

What author would think of passing over the history of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the patriarchs, the sojourn of Joseph in Egypt, his enslavement, his imprisonment, his elevation to honor and power, the removal of his father's family to Egypt, their reception, settlement, prosperity, and degradation to servitude, their history in that servitude for centuries, and a thousand other events of thrilling interest to the historian, allotting to all these important events only the brief space allowed them in the book of Genesis? It is folly to imagine that the scheme of the book originated with Moses.

The evidence in the subsequent books of the Pentateuch against a human origin of their plan, is equally forcible. Who has not felt, in reading the account of the exodus, and of the journeying of the children of Israel in the wilderness, an almost irrepressible desire to know more of those singular events, and a secret regret that we were not furnished with a more copious history of them? Every such feeling declares that if we had written the books, we should not have confined them to so narrow limits; it should be regarded as evidence that if man had planned the work, he would have conformed it more

carefully to the dictates of our curious nature. Had the writers of the sacred volume been disposed to give a full historical account of their times, they were competent to the task; but this admission does not prove by any means that they did or could conceive the design of the Bible as it now is. They would have been likely to omit their own faults and the crimes of their people; they would have narrated, with greater minuteness, those events which would exhibit their nation to advantage. A single verse would not have been allotted to the biography of some of their mighty monarchs, or a few lines only to some of the greatest events, which would fill a volume of ordinary history. Compare the history given in the Bible, of the protracted and bloody wars of the Jews, with the histories of events of similar magnitude, as given by Roman and Greek historians. What historian would write two such books as the Chronicles? What purpose of ordinary history would they serve? They serve a valuable purpose in the Bible, but would be of little or no use in any other history. There was a great object before the mind that conceived the plan of the whole book; otherwise, those two books would never have been what they are. God was "getting up" a book, and Moses and others were his amanuenses. They were to record just what he dictated. Facts which they perfectly knew, were not all needed; and it belonged to God to select such as he saw were necessary to his design, and to cause them to pass and repass the mind of the writer in words and sentences. Because they were familiar with those facts, they were no more the independent authors of the descriptions of them which they have given than of the predictions which we find scattered throughout their writings. Both were dictated to them by a mind that saw the whole plan at once; for the narrative and prophetic parts are interwoven in such a manner as to exclude the idea of the divine authorship of the one and not of the other. The blind Milton employed a scribe to write his works. That scribe might have been familiar with all the Scriptural, classical and historical allusions in "Paradise Lost;" or he might have been required by Milton to read from the Scriptures, from Homer, Virgil, or the works of contemporary historians, to find matter to be modeled into his verse. Did that

make him the poet? Would he be any more the author, or any less the servant of Milton, whatever might have been his ability to compose, or his knowledge of the matter employed? The scribe did not "get up" the book, but Milton; and the competency of his servant to write or to select, made no part of the excellence of the work. So when God saw fit to record a genealogical table, in which to preserve the descent of the tribes till the advent of the Messiah, he decided to extract from the chronicles of the kings of Israel and Judah just what he needed, and what he had superintended when the scribe of the realm made the record. He had therefore only to direct some one, probably Ezra, to copy such portions as he had selected, which, if read dissociated from the general design, would be almost destitute of interest, but cannot be dispensed with in the sacred volume, taken as a scheme of revelation. It may be asked, what sacredness is there, or what divinity, in such parts of the Bible as were copied from public, secular records? In reply we ask, what holiness was there in the incense which was burnt in the holy place? God says, "it is most holy." It was composed of precisely the same materials that the Israelites used in their food, medicine, or perfumeries; but compounded in a way stipulated by Jehovah for that specific use, and no other perfume might be made like it. It was set apart for a divine purpose. The special appointment of God gave it its holiness. So we say, although there was no holiness in those records when left by the king's scribe, still when they were incorporated in the sacred volume, they were there by the appointment of God for a divine purpose; and it required just as much divine influence to select them, and direct Ezra to copy them, as to foretell future events. It was not what Ezra wanted, but what God wanted, that made the books what they are. The plan of the Bible was not conceived by the writers, since it was the work of thirty or more different men; and, considering the harmony of design apparent in it, it is clear that one mind must have conceived the plan of the whole.

It may be objected that this theory will require us to consider God the author of the language of the Bible, as well as of the sentiments. But we beg to suggest the following things, as having some relation to verbal inspira-

tion. Can the human mind conceive, or receive, thoughts without words? Let the reader analyze his own thoughts, and see if he has any that are not clothed in words. Is not every thing we see and hear, as fast as we obtain distinct ideas of it, translated into words and sentences? It may be said that we often have an idea, which we cannot readily express. Granted; but our difficulty in giving expression to the idea results from one of two causes; either from the indistinctness of the idea, or from a conflict in our mind as to the form of expression which will best convey it. In reading or hearing profound thoughts expressed in very concise language, we are sometimes subjected to an effort of thought before we can see the meaning. We are then only translating the author's thoughts into our own language; and as soon as we see the force of the thought, we are prepared to convey it in our own language, and not in his. An illiterate hearer only understands so much of a speech as he can translate into his own order of language. He never thinks of quoting the language of the orator; and yet in his own language he can tell what he said.

Words are, with mortals, the only media of thought; hence in view of the preceding principles, we submit whether whatever God communicated to the minds of the inspired writers, did not come to their minds in words and sentences? Did the writers themselves select the facts which were suitable to be recorded out of the mass of facts that were familiar to their minds, or did God select them? If God selected such as he saw were necessary to his design, how did he signify his will to the writers, but by causing them to repass through their minds? And how could he cause them to repass through the mind but in words and sentences? Is it, however, maintained that we can think without words, or receive thoughts without words? Let the objector then account for the fact that foreigners always think in their vernacular tongue, even after they have learned our language, and have become quite familiar with it. Why do Germans always speak English in German idioms, the French, in French idioms, etc.? We are accustomed to say they think in German, or French. Why do scholars complain of the difficulty of thinking in Latin or Greek? Simply because they naturally think in their own tongue. We

have before shown that the brevity of Scripture narration cannot be accounted for, except by supposing that some one mind drew the plan and fixed the boundaries; and therefore whatever facts were selected out of many, must be communicated to the mind in some way; and what way would be more natural for God to use, than the ordinary vehicle, human language?

It is farther objected, that the language of many parts of the Bible is clumsy and imperfect, and consequently should not be ascribed to a perfectly wise being, who cannot do an imperfect act, nor a perfect act imperfectly; and it is asked, if God be the author of the language of the Bible, why are some portions so much more beautiful than others, as to style and language? Would not a perfect being be likely to throw undoubted marks of his perfection into all his works?

We reply by asking a few analogous questions. Is the noble elephant a better specimen of the Creator's skill than the inactive snail? Is a diversified landscape, covered with the richest verdure, and ornamented with fruits and flowers, more beautiful than a waste, sandy desert? Is man a more admirable creature than the filthy swine? The same God made them all. For aught we know, God might have thrown all the perfection of his works into a single specimen of his workmanship, or he might have made every part equally beautiful; but he has not chosen to do so any where else; and shall we demand in the Scriptures a departure from the general plan of his works? We may take a broad view of the created universe, full of beauty and of marks of infinite wisdom, and call it a single specimen of the Creator's skill and wisdom; and still the Bible will lose nothing by this view. We may look at the whole Bible as God's work, and who does not see grandeur, wisdom and skill in its construction? If there are some parts more beautiful than others, so there are in every other department of his works. Variety is a striking characteristic of creation and providence; and one of the strongest evidences of the divine authorship of the Bible is found in its manifest analogy to nature and providence. We see the same God in the rolling ocean, and the naked desert; in the splendid scenery of the mountains, and the simple beauty of the sequestered vale; in the terrible Leviathan, and the tiny insect that floats

in the sunbeam; in the mighty elephant, and the sluggish worm; in the lofty angel, and the lowest savage; in the splendid strains of Isaiah, the stirring eloquence of Paul, or the plain instructions of James. Therefore variety of style in the Scriptures, and even the plainness of the style of some portions, so far from weakening the evidence of their inspiration, supplies one of their best vouchers, analogy to nature. And in addition to this, it is evident that while God exerted a controlling influence over the minds of the sacred writers, he did it in such a way as to leave them to the free exercise of their natural powers, and the free employment of their own peculiar style. We confess there is mystery here; but mystery of the same kind, and no greater than that which enwraps the whole subject of the consistency of divine agency with human freedom.

Again, it is said that there is not only a difference in style, but some parts of the Scriptures are far less perspicuous and intelligible than others; they do not indicate the wisdom of the author, so much as other parts do. But is this proof against their divine inspiration? All men do not write in the same finished style. And besides, we might as well conclude that God must have employed some inexperienced agent in creating the brutes, because they do not so perspicuously exhibit the skill and wisdom of the Creator, as the nobler creature, man. Are all the events of providence equally intelligible? Is there nothing in creation for which we know no use? So if we find some things in the Bible for which we see no use, and others which we cannot easily understand, and some thoughts inelegantly expressed, or not harmonizing with our factitious standards, shall we hence conclude that they are not of God?

Hence, again, it is said that there is the style of thirty different men in the Bible; that their style is obviously in harmony with their character and condition in life; and that if the language were God's, we should not, in the writings, so clearly see the men.

But, in harmony with what is said above, we reply, did not God understand equally well the peculiar style of all these men? Shall we limit the Most High? Can he communicate only in a single style? Could he not make his communications to men in the peculiar style of each,

and would he not be likely to produce the needful variety of the Scriptures in this way?

The human family consists of an endless diversity of temperaments and casts of mind, and all are to be addressed by the Scriptures. Would the same style be equally adapted to those various minds? Most clearly not. God has constructed us with different tastes and appetites in every respect, both physically and intellectually. He has furnished us in nature with the means of gratifying every reasonable desire. There is no standard appetite or relish; each one may consult his own inclination, and he will find something in God's great garner adapted to his desire. So in the Scriptures, he has provided for various intellectual and moral tastes, and for the various circumstances of his intelligent creatures. What would deeply interest one mind, would be quite uninteresting to another of a different mould. God has therefore selected a great variety of minds, through which to make known his will to the world. Men of almost all occupations, from the sceptered monarch to the humble fisherman, have been chosen; they have been subjected to almost every variety of condition, prosperous and adverse, in order to shape their character and feelings to the nature of the instructions, of which they were to be the channels to the world. In selecting the apostles, Christ chose men of very diverse characters. What would twelve men like the tender and loving John have effected, as pioneers in the gospel field? And what, twelve like the didactic and practical James? And what, twelve like the bold, often rash and zealous Peter? And what could twelve accomplish without just such characters as the apostles exhibited? They were all indispensable. Humanly speaking, the strength of the apostolic college consisted in the happily diversified characters composing it. Peter with his vehement zeal might reach some, whom the modest and gentle John would not touch. The practical philosophy of James might arrest some, whom neither the glowing zeal of Peter, nor the gentle love of John could subdue; but all together constituted just the elements of great moral power. So in revealing his will to the world, God has chosen the learned and the rude, kings, counsellors, statesmen, philosophers, poets, physicians, agriculturists, mechanics, shepherds and fisher-

men, as his agents; and by conforming his communications to their various features, intellectual, moral and social, he has made adequate provision to reach, instruct, comfort and support all classes of men, in all times and under all circumstances. He has diversified the lot of each individual writer, according to the scope of the truth of which he was to be the organ. The psalms of David are wide enough in their scope to meet the wants of all classes, from the monarch to the beggar. That he might be qualified for the work of writing them, he rose from the obscurity of a shepherd boy to the dignity of a prince in the house of Saul. From that elevation, he was driven out to be a fugitive, hiding himself in the fastnesses of the mountains, hungry, thirsty, destitute, afflicted and tormented. He was then raised to the throne of a mighty kingdom; fell into sin, and saw the pestilence sweeping over his realm; he bowed, a broken-hearted penitent, at the throne of mercy, and prayed for pardon. Prosperity was restored; but again, he fled before the face of his favorite son. Thus he was qualified to be the reprover, the instructor, and the comforter of the lowly and the exalted, the prosperous and the afflicted, the rejoicing saint, and the self-reproaching sinner. By subjecting the sacred writers to such a lot as would enable them to record their own experience in the lessons of instruction which they were chosen to impart to us, God has contrived to link the past, present and future in bonds of holy sympathy and fellowship, and thus make the instruments of revealing his will contribute to the great end of revelation, the restoration of fellowship and love to mankind.

What is the chief excellence of Shakspeare, the prince of dramatic poets, as a writer? Does it not lie,

1. In conceiving clearly an effect which he designs to produce?

2. In selecting characters suited to his design?

3. In presenting those characters to the minds of his readers, so that they seem to be acquainted with them?

4. In putting language into their mouths which seems to be just what we should expect from them, and just what no one else could so well say?

Now was it his characters that spoke, or was it Shakspeare?

Was it Anthony, who made the speech over the dead

body of Cæsar, or was it Shakspeare, putting words into the mouth of Anthony? No one doubts here, that we are conversing with the mind of Shakspeare. These are his thoughts, his words, and his style. So God conceived an effect, which he would produce upon the minds of mankind. He selected his characters, and adapted them to the purpose he designed to serve by them. He then communicated his will to them, allotting to each just such a department as he was moulded for, and which no one else could so well fill. It is the voice of God, speaking through human organs to men, in various styles, suited to their various classes, and to all their diversified circumstances.

This view of inspiration, as we have suggested, does not necessarily interfere with the voluntariness of the writers, nor make them mere machines. In communicating his will to them, God addressed their intellectual and moral faculties. Every thought might pass through their minds as any other thought did, except some of the prophecies, which they were not permitted to understand, "that they without us should not be made perfect." For we are informed that they "inquired and searched diligently," after the meaning of some of the prophecies, relating to the gospel day. "Searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." The writers were, undoubtedly, conscious of the control of the Spirit over their minds in most cases, though there are, in two or three instances, sentences, which they were not confident were by inspiration: as when Paul says, "I give my judgment;" "I give my advice;" "I think I have the Spirit of God."

Is it objected to this view of inspiration, that it makes the language of wicked men and evil spirits, a part of revelation?

We reply, that it was intended to embrace these as a part of inspiration, but not to make God the author or the endorser of the sentiments of wicked men or devils; but to show that he was the author of the Bible, in which he has caused the words and acts of evil spirits and evil men to be recorded for our benefit. We need to know something of the devil, that we may know how to "resist"

him. We need to know how God deals with wicked men ; and in order to know, we must have their conduct brought before us, that we may understand his providential administration towards them. We needed the history of Job ; but could not know Job fully, without knowing something of the nature and extent of his trials and temptations, and the sources of them. Had Job said all that is ascribed to him, in the book bearing his name, without our knowing what the devil had said and done, and without knowing the feelings and words of Job's three friends, and Elihu, the book would have been an inexplicable mystery to us ; but now it is perfectly intelligible, full of instruction and consolation.

God, therefore, wisely caused the part of these characters to be recorded, that not Job only, but the history of Job might in all time bear testimony to the faithfulness of God to his tried children ; prove the sufficiency of divine grace to sustain in deep afflictions ; show the wiles of Satan ; throw light on dark providences ; show a specimen of remarkable integrity under the greatest provocations ; afford to the latest generation a specimen of very ancient moral philosophy and poetry ; and finally, teach us the safety of trusting in God in the greatest calamities. We could not part with any chapter of the book of Job without losing an important means of knowing Job's real character, and greatly weakening the moral influence of the book. The part these characters have in the book, is as necessary to the design of the book, as any thing that Job said, and is therefore just as much a part of revelation. It takes the whole book to make the impression intended. Those portions of the Bible, therefore, which show us the workings of depravity, are just as much in the book by God's will, as the holy sentiments, and just as necessary to the end for which it was written.

Sceptics sometimes sneer at the Bible, because, as they say, it has the appearance of being a compilation of scraps, gathered up from various writers, of different periods of time.

God has chosen this form for the Bible, because it will most effectually silence this very objection in the mind of any candid and reflecting man. Had the Bible been written all at one time, it would have lacked one of the strongest evidences of its divine authorship. There might have

been some plausibility in the charge of collusion among the writers, had they all lived and written at the same time. But since they lived at different times, in different countries, and wrote in several languages, there is little ground for suspecting collusion.

Had all the writers been kings, or all contemporary prophets, or all shepherds, or all fishermen, we might, with some plausibility, have suspected that they wrote by agreement, or compared notes to prevent discordant sentiments, or discrepant historical incidents. But they were not contemporary, nor of similar rank or profession, nor did they write in the same language; and yet they agree. Kings, lawgivers, priests, prophets, shepherds and fishermen, during the space of more than 1500 years, contributed to make up a book of unequalled wisdom, purity and concord, which we call the Bible.

We have before shown, that the number of writers and their difference of rank, profession and education, have given pleasing variety to the Scriptures. So we say the distance of time between the writers, gives us variety in the imagery and idioms of the Bible. One portion was given in one generation, and another in another, the idioms having undergone a change; so that we have a succession of philological monuments of the antiquity of the Scriptures.

Again, the accounts of the connection of Israel with Syria and Chaldea, at different times, are corroborated in the same manner by the occurrence of Syriac words and idioms, and of whole chapters of Chaldaic in connection with those accounts.

But perhaps a more important reason why the Scriptures came to us so gradually, may be found in the incapacity of our race to receive and digest all needful truth at once. Man's "foolish heart was darkened," and could not bear so much light at once; as a prisoner, who had been long confined in a dungeon, could not be brought out into meridian sunlight, without peril to his natural vision. The Israelites could not even bear the glory of Moses's countenance when he had been in converse with God. God, therefore, sent his communications gradually, and suited in form to the condition of those to whom they were addressed. The great truths regarding redemption must be hidden at first under the veil of Le-

vitical ceremonies; or rather, perhaps, drawn out in pictures to men's senses. When Christ came, he could not instruct his disciples in all things which they needed to know; but said, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." The race to whom the Scriptures were given is a progressive race; the world in which they live is full of marks of progression. Every thing is developed gradually. Hence, if the gradual development of divine truth is objected to, we may, for the same reason, conclude that God is the author of no part of the animal or vegetable creation, because they do not make their appearance at once in a state of maturity. If one is gradual, we should expect, if it was from the same God, that the other would be also.

It has been said that many of the moral truths of the Bible are to be found in the writings of heathen philosophers; and that they must have discovered them by "the light of nature," and therefore all the morality of the Bible may be of human origin.

We admit that some of the doctrines of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero and Seneca are coincident with revelation; yet their moral doctrines, as a whole, are corrupt enough to ruin any civilized nation that should adopt them. How totally opposite the laws of forgiveness by Jesus Christ, and the instructions of the philosophers! How different the instructions of the Scriptures to the afflicted, from those of Seneca! "Be patient in tribulation"; "Tribulation worketh patience"; "Our light afflictions, which are but for a moment, work for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory"; "Rejoicing in tribulation"; are the sentiments of Paul. Seneca says: "Art thou in trouble? Seest thou that tree, that precipice, that river, that sword? They offer thee deliverance." Suicide was his remedy.

We do not deny that there are virtuous sentiments in the writings of those philosophers; nor do we positively assert that they borrowed those sentiments from revelation. But we ask the reader's attention to a few facts that lead us to suspect strongly that they knew something of revealed truth. The Egyptians would not soon forget the events connected with the exodus of the Israelites. At least, several of the plagues would be memorable and notorious. The destruction of Pharaoh and

his army in the Red Sea, by such a marked interposition of Providence, would also be likely to be remembered, even if the Egyptians never heard of the Israelites afterwards. And it is hardly credible that such events should not have been described by the historians of the time. Egypt has been called "the birth-place of science, and the nursery of the scholars of other nations." Some of the renowned Greeks studied in Egypt, and might very probably have learned something of the Jehovah of the Hebrews by residing in Egypt, if those mighty events had failed to reach their ears at home. But Judea is not so remote from Greece, that such events as occurred in the journeyings and settlement of the Israelites, subduing kingdoms, razing strong walled cities, and receiving such wonderful deliverances by divine interposition, might not have reached them by the time their philosophers flourished. The reign of such a monarch as David could hardly be unknown to nations even farther off than Greece. True, the Greeks had not become a nation at that time of much influence or intelligence; but still their ancestors lived in Asia Minor and Greece at that time, and would be very likely to know something of those singular events. When Solomon was upon the throne of Israel, his fame reached even to Ethiopia, and drew the queen herself to his capital. Hiram, king of Tyre, was in alliance with Solomon; in his extensive commercial pursuits he was in communication with every country on the Mediterranean; almost the whole known world was laid under contribution to the glory of Solomon's kingdom. Did Grecian scholars never hear of these things? Or could they know the glory of the Jewish kingdom, and not know any thing of their God, their temple and their religion?

Before the birth of Plato, the Jews were extensively scattered over the surrounding countries. The return from the Babylonian captivity, and the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple, occurred a little before the birth of Socrates. Did all these events occur, and the reading, the inquisitive, the ambitious Grecians never hear of them? It is certain that the Greeks had occasion to pay their respects to the Jews in their own capital, a little after the death of Socrates and Plato, in the reign of Alexander; but not till after long and bloody wars, with

much more distant nations in the same direction ; and the same nations that had so recently destroyed Jerusalem, and carried its inhabitants into captivity, and in whose court had flourished Esther, Daniel, Mordecai, Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego.

Again, when we consider the eagerness of Grecian scholars for foreign literature, we can hardly believe that the books of so renowned a lawgiver as Moses had not been heard of.

The Roman moralists, Cicero and Seneca, could not have been altogether ignorant of the religion of the Jews. Judea was a province of Rome, sixty years before the birth of Cicero, and 160 before the birth of Seneca. The Roman army spent much time in Judea during the lifetime of Cicero, and multitudes of Jews lived in Rome, who were afterwards expelled in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar. Jerusalem had been one of the most famous cities in the world long before the foundations of Rome were laid. Its history was intimately connected with that of Tyre, Edom, Egypt, Damascus and Babylon, all of which cities and kingdoms were among the conquests of Alexander, and such as remained in Cicero's days were Roman provinces. Would Cicero, the Roman senator, be ignorant of the government of so important a Roman province? Could he know the government of the Jews, without knowing something of their religion?

Seneca was born two years before Christ, and was contemporary with all the astonishing events connected with his life, tragical death, and resurrection; and did not write his "*Morals*," till after the gospel was extensively spread over the empire, was rife in Rome, and to be found in "Cæsar's household." Now the man who assumes as an established fact, that the fragments of moral truth found in the writings of these men are the productions of unaided reason, must have overlooked or disregarded these facts. Their views of Jehovah may have been very imperfect, and their knowledge of the true religion may have been scanty; yet it is hardly possible, that they had not enough to supply the scattering truths in their works that coincide with revelation, and even more than they would incorporate in their systems, on account of natural repugnance to pure moral truth.

Ancient tradition, too, must have supplied all nations

with some fragments of revealed knowledge; for we find that nearly every nation that has been yet discovered, has traditions of the flood, the ark, and many other facts of Bible history. The longevity of the early patriarchs favors this opinion. Adam lived contemporary with Methuselah, 240 years; Methuselah with Noah, 600 years; Noah with Shem, 450, and Shem with Abraham, 150; so that we have a chain of only four links from the creation to the one hundred and fiftieth year of Abraham, long after the dispersion. In the absence of books, it would be natural for those patriarchs to give their accumulations of historical truth to their posterity. May not the eight members of the family of Saturn, viz. Saturn, Rhea, Jupiter, Neptune, Pluto, Juno, Ceres and Vesta, have been a corrupted form of the tradition of Noah and his family? and the division of the universe between Jupiter, Neptune and Pluto, the corruption of the division of the earth among Noah's sons, Shem, Ham and Japhet? The corrupt myths of Pagan nations do not so much prove the absence of inspired knowledge, as the prevalence of depravity, which has led to the corruption of the little they had. "Because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened; professing themselves to be wise, they became fools; and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four footed beasts, and creeping things." "They changed the truth of God into a lie;" "Even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge." Rom. chap. 1. Hence though there may be sentiments in the writings of heathen philosophers that coincide with revelation, they cannot be proved to be the productions of unaided reason, but rather appear to be a corrupted form or association of revealed truths.

It was not our purpose to pursue the usual course of argument to establish the inspiration of the Scriptures, nor to answer all the common cavils and objections of sceptics; but simply to endeavor to establish by an outline of argument, and by a refutation of objections, a theory of inspiration, which honors the whole Bible with the term inspiration in the same sense.

The Bible is God's book. It is what he made it. It

bears the impress of his wisdom, his goodness and his holiness. No part of it is unworthy of Deity. Its living, breathing poetry, its pathetic descriptions, the conciseness of its history, the burning eloquence of the prophets, the inimitable beauties of Job, the sighing lament of Jeremiah, the exquisite sweetness of John, and the lofty rhetoric of Paul, will stand as models in literature through all time. Like the book of nature, its truths are apparently scattered without system, throughout the volume. The facts in geology, botany, chemistry, zoology and philosophy are not left by the Creator's hand, arranged and classified, but scattered over the face of creation, so as to furnish pleasing and profitable work for man. So the Bible is constructed like the volume of nature, in order to furnish grateful employment for man's powers, through time and eternity, to discover, arrange and show the relations of those truths that exhibit God's moral character, and human condition and destiny. And if it required the infinite God to make every part of creation, no matter how diminutive, so it required the same degree of divine influence to collate from public records such incidents as were needed; to select from passing events such as would answer the purpose intended; to narrate the events of creation; to predict future events; to work the philosophic pen of Solomon; to sweep the harp of David; to sigh in the plaintive strains of Jeremiah; to astonish with the burning rhetoric of Paul; or melt with the gentle love of John.

When we attempt to measure off the acts of God, and assign to him degrees of influence in a matter where he claims to be the pervading Spirit, it is to degrade him to finiteness, it is to strike from our most cherished hopes their main pillars, and from the means of human elevation and salvation the only rational hope.

M. S.

Eaton, N. Y.

ARTICLE V.

THE SPECIFIC PROMISES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The writings of the apostle Paul abound with figures of speech, employed to illustrate and enforce divine truth. Sometimes he drew instruction from military life; as when he said, "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" He wished to guard the sacramental hosts against every mistake, and to teach the church of God successful warfare against Zion's foes. In time of war, the trumpet gave the signal for an attack, for a retreat, and for all important movements. It was a matter, therefore, of primary and indispensable necessity, that the trumpet should give the certain sound; lest the army should be thrown into disorder, and become an easy prey to the enemy. It was also important that those whose movements were to be guided by the trumpet, should understand the signification of the sound. The apostle presents this subject for the consideration and improvement of the Corinthian church, in which disorder and confusion prevailed in consequence of mistakes concerning spiritual gifts.

In religious matters, it is of the greatest importance both to teach and to believe correctly. We have painful evidence that the most confused and erroneous opinions have been taught and believed as the truth of God. Under the influence of feeling, impressions, dreams and the like, many are led into the most extravagant notions and fanatical conduct. Such deluded persons not unfrequently fancy themselves supported in their chimeras, by the promises of supernatural aid made to the apostles and other divinely inspired men. They tell us that they feel some particular thing to be thus or thus; that God has told them to do this act or the other; and, in confirmation of it, they cite some Scripture promise of supernatural aid, made to the apostles to enable them to work miracles! Some trumpet has given an uncertain sound upon

this subject; or if certain, grossly wrong and highly dangerous.

The subject now to be considered is, the distinction between the promises of aid made expressly to the apostles and other inspired men, and the promises made to them in common with other Christians. There has been a strange and hurtful confounding of these together. The apostles were regenerated by the power of the Spirit of God, like other men who are born again. Between them and other true Christians, in this respect, it is not reasonable or scriptural to suppose any difference. Their faith in Christ as the Saviour, is that which alone justifies them in the sight of God. With this saving faith in Christ, they will be accepted of God, and enter heaven; without it, no one can be saved, whatever gifts, graces and powers he may exercise. The supernatural gifts, which enabled the apostles and others to work miracles, were distinct from this saving faith in Christ. They were given for the purpose of demonstrating the truth of the Christian religion, and as an auxiliary in commencing its establishment in the world. Hence it is natural that the words of the Saviour to his apostles should contain promises and directions concerning these gifts, and the proper exercise of them. But it does not follow that ordinary Christians are to apply these promises, in any way, to themselves. Is it asked, of what use are they? and why they are placed in the Bible, if they are applicable only to those who enjoyed miraculous gifts? It may be replied, they are a portion of the divinely inspired record of the truth of our religion; and therefore they are both instructive and useful to ordinary Christians. Let them be understood as such, and the happiest effects follow; our faith is strengthened and God is glorified.

The errors most prevalent, which result from mistaken views of these promises, relate to the baptism of the Holy Ghost, prayer, and the exercise of certain prerogatives.

I. The baptism of the Holy Ghost.

John the Baptist immersed, in the Jordan, in Enon, and other places where there was much water, those persons who confessed their sins and professed their belief in the coming Messiah. His language is, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh af-

ter me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." A beginning of the fulfilment of this prediction was made by our Lord, in endowing the twelve apostles and the seventy with miraculous powers, by which they healed diseases, and cast out demons. But the most striking and extensive fulfilment of it was on the day of Pentecost. In the first chapter of the Acts, Luke informs us that Christ commanded his disciples not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, "which, saith he, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence." Shortly after this, "when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing, mighty wind; and it filled all the place where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them, cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." This was, emphatically, the promised baptism of the Holy Ghost; a great and striking fulfilment of the prediction indeed. What influence did it produce on those favored persons who received it? Did it renew their hearts and make them Christians? No, this had been done long before. They had also, doubtless, received those ordinary, sanctifying influences, which are enjoyed by all Christ's true ministers and followers. What, then, did it do for them? It enabled them to speak with other tongues; to preach the gospel in languages which they had never learned. All at once, they had the power to unfold the mystery of Christ with great facility and effect, in no less than sixteen different languages and dialects. This was being baptized with the Holy Ghost to some purpose. And this was a gift distinct from, and independent of, common Christian faith. These seasons of prayer, enjoyment and duty, were, doubtless, attended by a large increase of sanctifying grace; still the baptism of the Holy Ghost, as we understand it, implies the bestowal of supernatural gifts.

After the Pentecost, through the laying on of the apostles' hands, similar gifts were granted to ministers and

others. Even before this, our Lord empowered his ministers to work miracles; but on this ever memorable occasion, their miraculous powers were greatly enlarged. That the gift to work miracles was distinct and different from common Christian faith, is clear from the fact that, in most cases, it was not conferred until some time after its subjects had become Christians. In some instances, also, it appears probable that Jehovah, for wise reasons, permitted it to be exercised for a time, by such as had no saving faith. Why is this any more strange than that Saul, and Balaam, and Caiaphas should for a season have the spirit of prophecy? Judas probably possessed supernatural gifts, similar to those of the eleven. Matthew says, "These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, as ye go, preach, saying the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils; freely ye have received, freely give." Here is a commission and authority for them all, including Judas; and yet the betrayal of Christ by Judas, his wretched end, and dreadful doom, prove him to have been without the love and grace of God in his heart. The baptism of the Holy Ghost was intended to confer supernatural gifts and powers on the apostles and early Christians, for the purpose of proving the truth of our religion, and of assisting in establishing and extending it. There is no satisfactory proof that it continued much, if at all, after the apostles' day. Why should it continue longer? Christ's religion was abundantly proved to be true, by many infallible signs; and God, who is not prodigal in gifts, had no further use for its exercise, and therefore ceased to bestow it.

II. The distinction between the promises of miraculous gifts to the apostles, and the promises made to them in common with ordinary Christians, ought to be kept in view with reference to prayer. The following Scriptures belong to the class in question. "If two of you shall agree on earth, as touching any thing they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven." This is, manifestly, a promise made to the apostles, as such. It must necessarily be confined in its strict application to inspired men, who pray under the guidance of that Spirit, by whom they are infallibly instructed to ask for some gift or grace, which it is the will of God to be-

stow. It was delivered in connection with the promise, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven," and addressed to the same persons. Another promise, limited in a similar manner, is this: "And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive." This promise is addressed directly to the apostles, and that too in the exercise of supernatural gifts. In the same connection, Jesus declares, "If ye have faith and doubt not, ye shall not only do this which is done to the fig-tree, but also if ye shall say unto this mountain, be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea, it shall be done." Mat. 21: 21. The evangelist Mark, in narrating the same occurrence, relates the words of Christ as follows, (11: 28, 24,) "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea, and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that those things which he saith shall come to pass, he shall have whatsoever he saith. Therefore I say unto you, what things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them." Such prayers, then, must be accompanied with the faith that would enable the offerer to work miracles. Our Lord was enlarging on the magnificent works they could do with such faith; yet all these wonders were to be accomplished in answer to this kind of prayer. Such prayer would be answered, whatsoever they might ask. But these promises must refer to something different from the promises made to prayer in ordinary cases. Their import is widely different from the import of the following: "The effectual, fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." "Ask and ye shall receive; seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you." All sincere and humble prayer, offered in the name of Christ, is, doubtless, in some way answered. But we are no where encouraged to believe that we shall receive every thing that we may suppose we need, simply because we ask for it. Prayer that is truly acceptable is offered in submission. Even Christ prayed repeatedly, that the cup might pass from him. The apostle prayed thrice that the thorn might be removed. Yet neither of these things were done; still the

prayers, in both instances, were answered. Jesus said, "Not my will, but thine, be done; and there appeared an angel unto him, from heaven, strengthening him." And the Lord said unto Paul, "my grace is sufficient for thee." But Jesus encouraged his disciples to repose implicit confidence in his promise, that whenever they should pray for any supernatural gift, believing, it would certainly be given them. This must be confined to the miraculous powers needed by divinely inspired men in the execution of their commission. The Spirit given to them would guide them infallibly in asking the gifts requisite for their supernatural work. It was proper, therefore, for God to pledge to them in all cases the aid which, in the faith of miracles, they asked. This promise belonged to them alone; and not even to them, should they ask other things than those specially intended. Notwithstanding their near intercourse with God, and the success they enjoyed in their work, they were still human. They were often in want; they suffered from hunger, nakedness, peril and the sword; and many of them finally died martyrs to the truth. But if the promise that they should receive whatsoever they might ask was general, embracing common things, it was their own fault that they were ever in want, or that they suffered from persecution at all. They had only to ask, and every want would be supplied, and every foe laid in the dust. It is evident, therefore, that the promises of Christ to bestow every thing they should ask, were restricted in their application, and must, in the nature of the case, be confined to their working of miracles. Hence the Scriptures containing these promises ought to be carefully distinguished from those which relate, in general, to God's purpose to answer prayer.

III. A similar distinction ought to be observed in the exercise of certain prerogatives.

The apostles were authorized and even commanded to do some things which it would be presumption in us to undertake; things such as it would be unlawful for any to attempt, excepting persons specially commissioned. They possessed supernatural endowments, qualifying them for peculiar services. Our Lord said unto them, "Verily I say unto you, if ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say to this mountain, Remove

hence to yonder place, and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you." But this is not the ordinary Christian faith that unites the soul to Christ and saves it. It is the faith of miracles. He declares to them that if they have that faith as a grain of mustard seed, that is, in a very small measure, it should give them the power of removing mountains, and nothing should be impossible unto them. But this, evidently, is not a promise made to ordinary Christians. It is not only innocent to be destitute of this faith, but it would be displeasing to God, and highly sinful for them to attempt the exercise of the prerogative supposed by it, because God has not given it to any but inspired persons.

He sometimes communicated to the apostles knowledge of the thoughts of men, and the power of discerning spirits; also authority to pronounce judgments and curses; which, for wise purposes, he has forbidden ordinary Christians even to attempt. The injunction is, "Judge not;" and again, "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord." These offices were, however, in a sense, exercised in the cases of Ananias and Sapphira, Simon Magus, and Elymas the sorcerer, by the apostles. And they were assured that whatsoever they should bind on earth, should be bound in heaven; and whatsoever they should loose on earth should be loosed in heaven. But these are by no means prerogatives belonging to any, except the individuals divinely appointed and furnished with supernatural powers. How astonishing and terrible has been the assumption of them on the part of papal Rome! How wide and deadly has been its sway! It is much to be deplored that the papists are not the only people addicted to the invasion of those prerogatives which belong to the Most High alone; prerogatives which are employed innocently by none else, save in the few cases where God has delegated them for a limited season, to men possessing those supernatural endowments, which have guided them to do the will of their Father in heaven.

The distinction between promises of aid made expressly to the apostles and other inspired men, and those made to them in common with other Christians, has now been traced so far as our space will allow. The distinction is a real and an important one; and it is greatly to be regretted that instruction, belief and practice have been

so erroneous, respecting the baptism of the Holy Ghost, prayer, and the exercise of certain prerogatives. Is it not time for the trumpet to give a certain sound, and for every one to be prepared for the battle?

This subject is susceptible of an important practical improvement, and should not be dismissed without serious reflection.

1. If the foregoing distinctions be correct, then those persons are in error who insist that because they are baptized with the Holy Ghost, they need care little for what they denominate water baptism. Indeed whether the preceding observations be correct or not, it is true that those who undervalue, or set at naught a positive institution of Christ, are in a serious error. But the error here referred to is one of greater magnitude and wider prevalence than is generally supposed. It has prevailed not only among fanatics and the grossly ignorant, who have arrogantly claimed extraordinary divine gifts, and vaunted these claims with disgusting impertinence and effrontery, but some of the more calm, grave, and better informed have partaken of this error. They recognize the work of the divine Spirit, renewing and sanctifying the heart. So far it is well. But their mistake consists in considering this operation the baptism of the Holy Ghost. By so doing, they fall into error in the interpretation of passages which relate to the gospel ordinance of baptism, and represent what they are pleased to style water baptism as a matter of very little consequence. With this view, some denominations of Christians have made it, so far as the water is concerned, a mere nullity. Individuals there are in every place, besides the whole sect of Quakers, who deny that the ordinance of baptism is now a duty. They set aside both this and the Lord's Supper; and talk long and gravely of the inward baptism of the Spirit. Thus the authority of Christ becomes of none effect, and his ordinances are annulled by erroneous opinions. But because God graciously renews and sanctifies the heart by his Holy Spirit, that is no good reason why the person so renewed and sanctified should neglect the command of Christ to be baptized in his name. And because the Spirit is the mighty agent who fits the soul for communion with God and the enjoyment of heaven, that furnishes a Christian man no good reason for declin-

ing to obey the revealed will of God. It is painful to hear those who profess to be the followers of Christ say, "We are now baptized with the Holy Ghost; we have received the principal thing; we are not careful about baptism in water; the baptism of the Holy Ghost is all that is really essential." There is in this language a mixture of sincerity, ignorance and conceit, that demonstrates how important it is that the trumpet should give a certain sound. They care nothing for baptism in water—that ordinance which the Saviour instituted, and himself submitted to, surrounded by the witnessing multitude, and with the approving, sealing Spirit of the Father from heaven! They care nothing for baptism in water—that ordinance which he solemnly enjoined on his disciples, to administer to all who should believe on his name. They commit the great practical error of despising the only kind of baptism that has been on the earth since the days of the apostles, or that will be till the end of time.

2. If the above distinctions be correct, then those persons mistake, who affirm that if two of them shall agree in any particular petition it will on that account be granted. This is a promise made to the apostles, and confirmed in the nature of the case to those who were inspired, and who prayed for supernatural aid to enable them to execute the work of their office. It cannot, then, apply to common Christians. The supposition that it does, is an extensive and a very injurious error. It has often been preached as a truth. Sincere and well-meaning Christians have claimed it as a promise to them, and endeavored to secure its fulfilment. Their failures have disappointed and depressed them; and the tendency has been to shake their faith in the efficacy of prayer, and to confirm the unbelieving in their infidelity. But of the utility and power of united prayer there can be no doubt. The more persons can be united in praying for things agreeable to God's will the better. The most glorious results follow importunate, united, submissive prayer. When we exercise its spirit in our own hearts, or witness its prevalence around us, it is an indication for good; and it is certain that things agreeable to the divine mind will be bestowed in answer to such prayer. But this is very different from believing that if two or more shall agree in prayer, whatever they ask will be granted.

Clearly no such promise is made to ordinary Christians. Hence when we hear persons praying for a given object,—for example, the conversion of a sinner before another morning, or the immediate overthrow of some anti-Christian power or influence, and placing their confidence of success in their prayers in the promise made to the apostles, that if two of them should agree as touching any thing they might ask it should be done, we cannot but be pained at the mistake, and tremble at such presumption. It is, doubtless, well to pray for the conversion of particular persons; it is highly proper to pray for the overthrow and destruction of any given evil, and of all evil; but as to time and the manner, and even as to the thing itself, we should exercise the most profound resignation; and not arrogantly assume that it will be done, merely because two or three agree in asking it. It may be the sovereign purpose of Almighty God to effect it at another and better time, and in another and different manner; and it may be, that he has already determined never to do that particular thing.

Great practical evils of most mischievous tendency arise from a misunderstanding of this promise. An individual in a church may desire the accomplishment of some particular and good object. Misunderstanding this promise, he thinks that all that is necessary to secure the object is to produce this agreement of views, sentiments and desires, so that there may be united prayer. But because the thing prayed for does not come to pass, his conclusion is that there is no right feeling, no agreement. He now feels less cordial towards his brethren; and soon by looks and words violates the law of Christian charity by judging them. But perhaps they are not, after all, in fault. Perhaps the evil is that he has misunderstood a passage of Scripture, and appropriated it to Christians generally, which was specially intended only for the apostles.

3. The same is true with reference to the prayers of individuals. While it is true that whosoever asketh receiveth, it is not true with Christians generally, that whatsoever they ask they shall infallibly receive. This promise was made to another class of persons, for another object. Perhaps this has been sufficiently shown already. Nor is this any discouragement to prayer. We are com-

manded to pray always with all prayer; and he who knows what we need even before we ask, has promised to do all that is necessary for us. He gives freely to all who ask, such things as enrich them and glorify himself. He who has commanded us to pray, has "all power in heaven and on earth," and is "able to do exceeding abundantly, above all that we ask or think." If we do not receive what we ask, he will give us something better. We may desire as strongly as we please, and pray as fervently as we can, yet every prayer that does not contain at least an implied "thy will be done," is impiety and dictation.

4. If the distinction suggested in this article be correct, those who assume to judge the hearts of men,—who promise heaven and bind over to hell,—assume a prerogative that does not belong to them. That believers in Jesus Christ will be saved, and that those who reject the only Saviour of lost sinners must perish, is established by divine authority. But the fact that the apostles sometimes discerned spirits, knew by revelation the state of the heart, and in the name of the Lord denounced judgments, furnishes no valid reason why other persons should claim these powers. For want of this distinction much error, fanaticism and even persecution have taken place. What sad illustrations of this are furnished by the long and bloody history of the church of Rome. For ages it has made itself red with the blood of the saints. It has ever claimed miraculous powers, professes to bind and loose, adjudges to heaven and to hell. Other anti-Christian powers have also set themselves in the temple of God, and invaded the divine prerogative.

The working of corrupt, ambitious nature, or passionate appeals from the deluded, or the instigation of the devil, have brought ignorant, fanatical and intolerant men to believe that they were specially commissioned of God to work some mighty reform. Then instead of quietly attending to some lawful and useful business, they assume to act the apostle, and play the minister of justice. This seems to constitute all their religion. Attack and denunciation are their common work. They stop not even to employ correct logic. They say, the old Jewish church was corrupt, therefore the churches of the present day are Babylon. The scribes and Pharisees

were hypocritical and oppressive, therefore the ministers of the gospel now are infamous and heartless "wolves in sheep's clothing;" and the bulwark of oppression in all its forms. And what would be more natural than that those persons who complacently look upon themselves as God's pure and chosen messengers to execute justice and judgment, should hurl the heaviest curses at those who, in their opinion, so richly deserve present and eternal infamy. Feeling themselves clothed with such important functions, it is not perhaps singular that their eyes should be so dazzled by the glittering insignia of their office, as not to perceive the lameness of their logic. Indeed, why should they stop to examine their logic? Divine wisdom, inspiration cannot err. This they feel conscious of possessing; and their extraordinary powers could not have been conferred, to lie dormant; they must have been given for use. Where is there a field more inviting for the sickle, than the ministry and churches? What other work so fit for the employment of these high and unerring gifts, as the unceremonious and indiscriminate thrusting of all Christendom to the bottomless pit!—and all, forsooth, because they cannot or will not, in relation to the doing or the manner of doing some certain thing, bow to their right dictation, or because they cannot see proof that, at a given time which they have fixed, God will consume the world and judge its inhabitants. To say nothing here of such impious assumption, it is clear that if such persons could discern the distinctions of things that differ made in the word of God, it would materially diminish their assumption of authority. It would make them, it is hoped, more modest and of better manners. Some of the leading disorganizers of the present day claim to be as much inspired as were the apostles. If the spiritual hallucinations of Swedenborgianism be harmless, the same cannot be claimed for Mormonism and Millerism. In the harvest gathered from their arrogant pretensions to spiritual discernment, and consequent assumption of divine prerogatives, we have ripe clusters from the vine of Sodom.

But were any now invested with the power of working miracles, the endowment would not be so valuable as simple, Christian faith. When the seventy returned to Christ, rejoicing that the devils were subject to them

.

through his name, he directed them to "rejoice rather that their names were written in heaven." Paul says, "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge; and though I have all faith so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." Charity is Christian love—a love flowing from simple faith in Christ. It is declared to be more important, and is more highly to be prized than any other attainment. How excellent are its properties, how redolent with the choicest odors, how enriched with the most beautiful ornaments! "It suffereth long, and is kind, it vaunteth not itself; is not puffed up; doth not behave itself unseemly." But one might possess even the gift of miracles, and still be destitute of saving grace. So did Judas Iscariot. But let men beware how they claim any prerogatives, requiring these uncommon endowments.

5. As the word of God contained in the Bible is a sufficient revelation, its plain and obvious meaning should be sought and received as the will of Heaven. Mistakes on other subjects may be less injurious; empiricism here is fatal. Here let the trumpet give a certain sound, and let all take heed to its tones. The teachings of the holy Scriptures should be our guide; not the traditions of men, impressions, feelings, dreams and visions. Not the least dependence can be placed in them in matters of religious faith. So far as any impressions or dreams may lead those who have them to be more prayerful and more consistent in duty to God and man, it is well; but they are of no value in teaching what the will of God is. To guide us in this, we must depend not on a "thus saith the Lord" which some man affirms he has in his heart, but on a "thus saith the Lord" contained in the written word. To forsake the latter for the former would be "turning unto fables." It would be leaving the unerring word of God, to follow "the weak and beggarly elements of the world." And the fact that persons are sincere in their wild fancies, makes it no more safe to be influenced by them. Many of the Jews, doubtless, believed that they should have in the person of the Messiah, a temporal prince, who would deliver them from the Ro-

man yoke; but their sincere impression did not make it so. They rejected Jesus Christ as an impostor; but it did not make him an impostor. No doubt many good men, yea Christian men, have placed unwarrantable dependence on some feeling or impression. Some there are who talk in a most presumptuous manner, as to what is to take place in the future; and the reason of their belief is some impression. They tell us that they do not regard human learning and reason; they go by the Spirit, which they feel within. At different times, thousands have positively asserted that they should be alive on the earth when Christ should come to judgment. They had an impression that they should be—an impression which neither reason nor Scripture could remove. But if it is impossible to correct the mistakes of such deluded persons, the fact that they have died in their errors and have spread abroad in the world blasting, mildew and death, ought to be an admonition to others. In his own time, Christ will come to judge the world; but when it will be, we have the testimony of Jesus himself, that neither men nor angels know; and his declaration should weigh more with us than all the boasted visions of ignorant, superstitious and fanatical men from the foundation of the world.

“Let the false raptures of the mind
Be lost and vanish in the wind.”

To rely on these instead of our Saviour's own assertions, produces most appalling effects. It has encouraged those who know nothing, to hazard every thing in reckless statements and predictions. It has occupied the time and attention of serious Christians, to the detriment of the cause of religion. It has hardened the impenitent, and emboldened the scoffing infidel. It has even instituted an article of faith unknown to the holy Scriptures, and has set aside the divine promise, that “whosoever believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.” But the Bible, so far from affirming that in order to be saved it is needful to believe in the advent of Christ at any given time, declares that neither men nor angels know when he will come, but that at all times we should “watch and be ready.” Had the church generally been

led away by these delusions, months or years ago it would have been considered too late to translate, print or circulate the Bible in heathen lands. This great and blessed work must have ceased, and with what disastrous consequences ! The great work of giving the world a knowledge of Jesus Christ, the only Saviour, would have been arrested at once, and the hopes and prospects of the church, and of the whole heathen world, blighted forever. It may well be doubted, whether Satan himself ever devised a scheme more fraught with mischief, and, if carried out, more eminently calculated to prostrate the noble design of God and his people to enlighten and save the heathen.

ARTICLE VI.

ABORIGINAL MISSIONS IN NORTH AMERICA.

NOTES ON THE IROQUOIS ; or *Contributions to the Statistics, Aboriginal History, Antiquities and General Ethnology of Western New York.* By HENRY R. SCHOOLCRAFT. New York, Bartlett & Welford. 1846. 8vo. 285 pp.

The Indian Advocate. A monthly paper, by the American Indian Mission Association. Louisville, Ky.

NE KORORON, NE TEYERIHWAHKWATHA IGEN, *Ne Enyon-teste, Ne Yondatteskos Yagorihwiyoghston, Rotinensyonih Kaweanondahko, Ne Sorwatagwen.* ["The Collection of Sacred Songs, for the use of the Baptist Native Christians of the Six Nations."] Revised by JAMES C. CUSICK. Philadelphia. American Baptist Publication Society. 1846. 32mo. 128 pp.

A KEY INTO THE LANGUAGE OF AMERICA, or *an Help to the Language of the Natives in that part of America called New England.* By ROGER WILLIAMS. London. 1643. Reprinted by the Rhode Island Historical Society, Providence. 1827. 8vo. pp. 165.

On the first visit of Europeans to the American continent, it was found to be inhabited by a race of men, who, in their physical conformation, their moral habits, their

social and political relations, their languages and modes of living, differed materially from the inhabitants of the old world. The term *Indian*, as given to the aborigines of this continent, was a misnomer. It was supposed by Columbus and his coadjutors that they had reached the eastern shore of Asia, and, hence, the country was called *India*, and its inhabitants, *Indians*.

From whence they originated, and by what means they reached the continent of America, are questions yet unsolved. We differ wholly from Thoroughgood, Adair, Boudinot and others, who maintain that they are of Hebrew origin. After long acquaintance, frequent observations and diligent inquiries, we have found no marks of Judaism, but such as are common to other tribes of savage, or semi-civilized people.

The native inhabitants of North America were originally separated into several distinct classes, each class differing from the others in language, religion, manners, customs, figure and other characteristics. These classes again were subdivided into tribes and confederacies, which differed from each other in dialect, or pronunciation, and other slight modifications.

The classes, or divisions, with which we are the best acquainted may be arranged under the general names of *Esquimaux*, *Algonkin*, *N'Dacotah*, *Cherokee* and *Iroquois*. These classes are clearly defined in language and physiology.

The *Esquimaux* includes the nomadic bands along the coast of Labrador and the Northern Ocean to Behring's Strait, a distance of some three or four thousand miles. They are found principally north of the fiftieth degree of latitude, and, probably, originated from the Samoieds and Laplanders of Europe.

The *Algonkin*, or as termed by Mr. Schoolcraft, the *Algie* race, comprehended the largest number of tribes and confederacies, and the most people of any class in North America, though now reduced to the fewest. These aborigines have been the least impressed with civilization and Christianity, and have wasted away the most rapidly and surely at the approach of the "pale face." In every respect, they were inferior to the Iroquois or the Cherokee stocks. The term *Algonkin* is sometimes given to a branch of this stock in eastern Canada and

Nova Scotia. To this class belonged the Tarenteens, Norridgewoks and Penobscots in Maine and New Hampshire,—the Pockanockets, Aberginians, Wampanoags and Mohegans in Massachusetts, the Narragansetts in Rhode Island, the Pequods and other tribes in Connecticut, the Manhattanoes about New York city, the Lenni Lenopi (or Delawares) in New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware, the great Powhattan confederacy of more than thirty tribes in Maryland and Virginia, and the Chaouanons, or Shawanoes, who lived and roamed from James river south to Florida.

In the west and north-west, of the same stock were the O'jibways, Putawatomes, Ottawas, Saukies, Miamis, or Meaumees, the Illinois confederacy of seven or eight tribes, and many others.

A third original stock, or distinct class, is found west of the Mississippi river. The *N'Dacotah*, or Sioux as the French call them, are a type. To the same class belong the Winnebagoes, Ioways, Osages, Kausas, O'mahaus, Ottoes and many other bands. On further investigation, another distinct class may be found in the Pawnees, Comanches, and other wild Indians in northern Texas and Mexico.

A fourth radical stock is to be found in the south-west. The Cherokees, Choctaws, Muscogees or Creeks, Chickasaws, Natchez and many other tribes were radically different from the other classes. Probably they were offsets of the Mexican or Aztec race.

The fifth class, and the one to which we intend devoting this paper, is the IROQUOIS, or SIX NATIONS of middle and western New York and northern Pennsylvania. They have been known by different names. The English termed them *Mohawks*, from one of the nations; the Lenopi called them *Maquas*, and *Mengwe*, hence *Min-goes*. The Virginia Indians called them *Massawomeks*, and the French of Canada gave them the name of *Iroquois*, from *Hirô*, a word with which these Indians ended their speeches, as the Romans did theirs with the word *dixi*;—and *quois*, which they used to express strong emotion, whether of joy or grief. Their own generic name was *Ean-gwe-hon-we*,* meaning *the Real people*, or people in reality.

* Pronounced Ung-way-hong-way.

The Iroquois were the most powerful confederacy in North America, having something like a Federal government. Theirs was the only confederacy that deserved the name of government; for they had the elements of a confederated republic. Each nation had its own council-fire, and all local affairs were managed by its particular chiefs. Each nation was subdivided into three tribes, designated as the *Turtle*, the *Bear*, and the *Wolf* tribe. Other subdivisions or bands, according to the laws of the *Totem*, are noticed hereafter. Each village constituted a distinct republic, with its head men or magistrates to regulate its local affairs. The general interests of the whole confederacy were managed by the Great Council, which was composed of the chiefs from each nation and tribe, who met annually at the Great Council house in Onondaga Valley; and it is recorded that as many as eighty sachems [*Lachanuane*] were present in this congressional assembly. It had entire jurisdiction of the affairs of peace and war; the supervision of the tributary nations, and of all negotiations with the French and English colonies.

When first known to the French and English, there were five nations in the confederacy—all in that part of New York which lies west of the Hudson river, and in northern Pennsylvania. They were the Mohawks, the Oneidas, the Onondagas, the Cayugas and the Senecas. Their own traditionary accounts state that they originated from Canada. And after the confederacy had been formed, which is supposed to have originated about A. D. 1540, numerous people, of the same class, were in Canada, from Montreal westward to Lake Huron. And if we include all the tribes that spoke a dialect of the same language, and had other generic marks, we should note the Wyandots, or Hurons, the Erigas or Eries, the Allegans, and the Andastes or Guyandots. The Eries and Guyandots were exterminated in a series of wars by the confederacy of the Five Nations, between 1650 and 1670.

The *Tuscaroras* made the sixth nation in the confederacy. Originally, they resided in Pennsylvania and southwestern New York; but at some remote period migrated southward, and spread over and occupied a large section of North Carolina. Their own traditions affirm that their nation travelled westward until they reached Lake

Erie, and thence south-west until they reached the Mississippi. Part of them crossed the river, and they became a divided people. Mr. Schoolcraft, who records their traditions, (and we have had the same story from the Rev. James C. Cusick,) writes thus:—

“Terenyawagon, the Holder of the Heavens, who was the patron of the *home* lands, did not fail, at this crisis, to direct their way also. After giving them practical instructions in war and hunting, he guided their footsteps in their journeys, south and east, until they had crossed the Alleghanies, and reached the shores of the sea, on the coasts that are now called the Carolinas. They were directed to fix their residence on the banks of the Cau-tan-o, that is, a Pine in the Water, now called Neuse river, in North Carolina. By this time their language was altered, but not so much but that they could understand each other. Here Terenyawagon left them to hunt, increase and prosper, whilst he returned to direct the remaining Five Nations to form their confederacy.”

In the beginning of the eighteenth century, their villages were on the waters of Contentney, Neuse and Taw (improperly called Tar) rivers. According to Lawson,* in 1708 they had sixteen towns, and could raise 1200 warriors. They commenced a ferocious war with the white settlers in 1711, murdered Mr. Lawson, who was surveyor general of the colony, on Albemarle river, and fell upon the settlements and massacred 130 inhabitants in one day.

In 1712 or '13, they were attacked by the English colonists in turn on the one side, and by the Cherokees on the other, were sorely defeated, made peace, and the next year removed, united in the confederacy of their ancient people, and since that period, have shared the fortunes of the Six Nations.

The superiority of the Iroquois confederacy over the tribes of the Algonkin stock is incontestable. Their whole history furnishes proofs of their superiority in intellect, in energy of character, in perseverance, and in the preservation of their race. The Five Nations had acquired a decided superiority over the other Indians, before the arrival and settlement of Europeans on this continent. They evinced a most exalted spirit of liberty and independence, while they conquered and subjugated to their control nearly all the other tribes from the shores of the Atlantic

* Transactions, Amer. Antiquarian Society, Vol. ii, p. 82.

to the Mississippi, and even carried their victorious arms across the "Great Water."

They admitted no hereditary distinctions in their social organization. The office of chief was the reward of meritorious conduct. War was their favorite pursuit, and military glory their ruling passion. With high-toned feelings of liberty and a sensitive regard to their own rights, they trampled on the rights of all their neighbors, and exercised domination over them. Their conquests and dominion may be learned from nearly every author of the early history of the French and British colonies. Charlevoix says, (1720,) "The Iroquois are desirous of exercising a species of domination over the whole of this great continent, and to render themselves sole masters of its commerce." They destroyed great numbers, and broke up the principal villages of the Wyandots about 1650; finished the extermination of the Eries in 1655; and accomplished the ruin of the Andastes in 1672. They carried on a thirty years' war with the Choctaws of the south. The late Dewitt Clinton, in a lecture before the Historical Society of New York, in 1811, says, "To describe the military enterprise of this people, would be to delineate the progress of a tornado or an earthquake. Destruction followed their footsteps, and whole nations, subdued, rendered tributaries, expelled from their country, or merged in their conquerors, declare the superiority and terror of their arms."

When Admiral Champlain arrived in Canada in 1603, he found them at war with the Algonkins and Hurons. They subjugated the country of western Virginia, Kentucky and along the Ohio river on both sides, a part of Tennessee, nearly all Illinois, and the vast regions of the north-west. When Boon and his companions explored Kentucky, they found those fine hunting grounds without an inhabitant. About the middle of the seventeenth century, the Shawanoes from the south-east had planted their villages along its rich vallies. Its name, instead of meaning "the bloody ground," as fictitious tradition has recorded, is formed from a Shawanese word, which signifies "at the head of the river." Their villages were depopulated, and the people who survived were driven by the victorious arms of the Iroquois to the banks of the

Wabash. Hence the Iroquois were termed by the traveller Volney, "The Romans of the Western Continent."

In 1701, they made a deed of sale to the British government of a vast tract of country south and east of the Illinois river, and extending across the lakes into Canada. In 1758, their commissioners were at a treaty held by the Governors of Pennsylvania and New Jersey with the Lenopi Indians, and required them to give up to the colonies a tract of country which the Iroquois claimed by conquest. In 1768, a great council was held at Fort Stanwix (now Rome, N. Y.) between the commissioners of the British crown and this confederacy, in which they ceded to the English with whom they were in alliance, a large part of Kentucky, lying north of the river Louisa, (as Kentucky was then called,) including a part of western Virginia.

The Iroquois confederacy left the tribes over which their victorious arms had gained a supremacy, to manage their own internal affairs in their own way, and even to make war on other conquered tribes; but claimed tribute as a badge of submission, and entire sovereignty over all the lands they obtained by conquest. They were in constant alliance with Great Britain till the revolutionary war, when the confederacy became divided, and eventually broken up. The Mohawks, Senecas and others took up arms against the colonies. The Oneidas fought bravely on the American side. The Tuscaroras were divided among themselves; a part fought on the American and a part on the British side, and each party suffered damage in the contest. They were frequently on terms of general amity with the French of Canada, but never in strict alliance. They were more faithful to treaty engagements, and firmer and more lasting in their friendships, than any other Indians.

At the period of the early settlement of Canada, 1608, the Five Nations were supposed to number about 40,000 souls. This is certainly an over estimate. La Hontan, about the close of the seventeenth century, estimates each canton at 14,000; but he is notorious for exaggeration in all his statements. Still, however, they were populous; for at one period they attacked the island of Montreal with 1200 warriors, and in 1683, marched 1000 warriors against the Ottagamies. Mr. Schoolcraft states that,—

"Smith puts the whole number of fighting men, in 1756, with a moderation which is remarkable, compared to others who had touched the subject, at twelve hundred. Giving to each warrior a home population of *five*, which is found to hold good, in modern days, in the great area of the west, we should have an aggregate of 6000—a result which is, probably, too low. Douglass, four years after, gives us data for raising this estimate to 7,500. Colonel Bouquet, still four years later, raises this latter estimate by 250.

"Mr. Jefferson estimates the Powhatan confederacy or group of tribes, at one individual to the square mile. Governor Clinton, who ably handled the subject in 1811, estimates that if this rule be applied to the domain of the Iroquois in New York, an aggregate of not less than 30,000 would be produced; but he does not pass his opinion upon an estimate made so completely without reliable data.

"At a conference with the five cantons at Albany in 1677, the number of warriors was carefully made out at 2,150, giving on the preceding mode of computation, a population of 10,750; and this was the strength of the confederacy reported by an agent of the Governor of Virginia, who had been specially despatched to the conference for the purpose of obtaining this fact. Either, then, in the subsequent estimates of 1756, '60 and '64, the population had been underrated, or there had, on the assumption of the truth of the above enumeration, which is moderate, been a decline in the population of 3000 souls, in a period of eighty-seven years.

"During the American revolution, which broke out eleven years after the expedition and estimate of Bouquet, when he had put the Iroquois at 1550 fighting men, it is estimated that the British government had in their interest and service 1580 warriors of this confederacy. The highest number noticed of the friendly Oneidas and a few others, who sided with us in the contest, is 230 warriors, raising the number of armed men engaged in the war to 1810, and the gross population in 1776, to 9050 souls. This estimate, which appears to have been carefully made from authentic documents, is the utmost that could be well claimed. It was made at an era when danger prompted the pen of either party in the war to exhibit the military strength of this confederacy in its utmost power; and we may rest here, as a safe point of comparison, or, at least, we cannot admit a higher population."

Mr. Schoolcraft, who took the census of the Six Nations remaining in the State of New York in 1845, gives the following table.

Senecas,	2,441
Onondagas,	398
Tuscaroras,	281
Oneidas,	210
Cayugas,	123
Mohawks,	20
St. Regis Canton,	360
<hr/>	
Total,	3,833

To these we add Oneidas of Greenbay, Wisconsin,	720
Senecas of Sandusky,	251
<hr/>	
Total in the United States,	4,804
On Grand river, Canada West,	4,000
Caghnawagas, in Canada, say	300
<hr/>	
Making a grand total of	9,104

The estimate of the Rev. Mr. Cusick was about ten thousand. These statistics, which are from the best data that can be obtained, and, with the exception of those in Canada, from their census taken with great accuracy, brings us to the conclusion that the Iroquois are as numerous now as they were nearly one hundred years since. And, that, with all the depressing circumstances with which they have been surrounded, by their contact with white population and the influence of vicious habits, the Iroquois are a people not likely to be exterminated by the approach of the "pale face," as has happened to the Algonkin race. The fact of intellectual and moral superiority in some classes of the aborigines over others, has not hitherto received the attention of philanthropists and missionary associations as it should have done. Public attention, in efforts to promote civilization, has been directed chiefly to the Algonkin stock. These have melted away like the snows of spring, on the approach of civilization. Missions and other civilizing influences have produced on that race only partial and temporary effects,—enough, however, to afford illustration of the great truth that the gospel is adapted and intended for the benefit of the whole human race, even those who are in the most degraded and hopeless circumstances. But in reference to the aborigines of our country, it is to the Iroquois and Cherokee stocks that we are to look with encouragement and hope, as furnishing promising fields for missionary labor.

During the revolutionary war, the Iroquois suffered severely. War and disease cut off many of their young men, not only decreasing their numbers at that period, but lessening, in no small degree, the probabilities of future increase. Their farms and beautiful and extensive orchards were ravaged and destroyed on the invasion of General Sullivan into the Genessee country in 1779. Many of the Oneidas perished by dysentery and other epidemics.

In 1776 the Iroquois in the State of New York numbered 3748, and those who were then known as residing in Canada, 760, making a total of 4508. Suppose the Mohawks and Cayugas who fled to Canada at and after the period of the war were 2000 souls, it would give for the whole population of the Six Nations 6508. Mr. Schoolcraft estimates their number in Canada, in 1845, at 2000, which is the same number which he supposes to have removed there, without any addition for increase. But that branch of the Iroquois confederacy have made proportionate advances in civilization with their brethren in New York. Mr. Cusick, who visited their settlements in 1844, examined into their condition, and made special inquiries about their numbers, estimated them at 4000. Of the Iroquois in New York, Mr. Schoolcraft says,—

“ I cannot, however, submit this result [increase of population] without expressing the opinion, that the Iroquois population has been lower, between the era of the revolutionary war and the present time, than the census now denotes ; and that for some years past, and since they have been well lodged and clothed and subsisted by their own labor, and been exempted from the diseases and casualties incident to savage life, and the empire of the forest, their population has recovered, and is now on the increase.”

The census shows five with a large fraction as the average number of each family. Each branch of this stock is not only on the increase, but they are fast becoming a civilized people. The Tuscaroras raised more grain and cattle than were necessary for their own subsistence, while the other bands have been enabled, for several years, to live on their own resources.

The census statistics furnished by Mr. Schoolcraft from the families resident in the State of New York, in 1845, give 908 horses ; 839 sheep ; 3458 hogs ; neat cattle 2275 ; cows milked 803 ; pounds of butter made 20,341 ; acres of improved land on their reservations 13,867½ ; acres of meadow, mowed annually, 1350 ; acres rented to white farmers, at an average rent of \$2,82 per acre annually, 3515 ; fruit bearing trees, chiefly apple, 6868 ; farmers 371 ; mechanics 20 ; lawyers 2 ; semi-hunters, or those who derive subsistence in part from the chase, 151 ; persons educated at colleges, or academies, 20 ; physicians 7 ; ministers of the gospel, catechists and teachers 17 ; inter-

preters or translators of the Iroquois language, 35; houses for Christian worship, 8; church members of all denominations, 350; pledged to temperance, 870; schools, 14; children attending private or select schools, 462; bushels of wheat harvested, 11,508; corn, 35,499½; potatoes, 16,681; oats, 28,866½; rye, 60; turnips, 353; barley, 178; peas, 910; beans, 44; buckwheat, 1054. Annuities paid by the United States, \$12,765; by the State of New York, \$5,661,69. Mr. Schoolcraft subjoins:

"I found three saw mills, with twenty-one gangs of saws, on the Alleghany reservation, and also two council houses and two public schools, constituting public property, belonging exclusively to this reservation, which were valued by the appraisers under the treaty of 1842, at \$8,219.

"On the Cattaraugus reservation, there is a church, council house and farms connected with the schools, being the property of the Indians and not the missionary society, which were valued together by the same appraisers, at \$3,214,50.

"There is on Buffalo creek reservation, a saw mill, valued at \$404,75; a church built originally at an expense of \$1700, valued at \$1200; a council house valued at \$75; making a total amount of public property, including all the preceding, of \$13,113,25.

"The total amount of private valuations on the Buffalo and Tonawanda reservations, under the treaty of 1842, was not exactly ascertained, but it is about \$80,000. This is entirely Seneca property and funds. * * * * *

"The Onondagas possess one saw mill, well built and in good repair, which is of some value to them, and might be rendered more so, under a proper system of management."

Having glanced at the proofs of the increase of population of the Iroquois, and their advancement in civilization, we are now prepared to contemplate the influence of the gospel by missionary agency in their reformation.

Some partial efforts were made to Christianize the Six Nations in the earlier part of the seventeenth century, by ministers of the Reformed Dutch Church, and subsequently by those of the English Episcopal Church. Societies were gathered at an early day amongst the Mohawks at Caghnawaga, and at Dionderoga, at the mouth of Schoharie creek, better known as Fort Hunter. The church at that place received a set of communion service from the liberality of Queen Anne. The Roman Catholic priests in Canada converted a portion of the Caghnawaga band to their faith, now known as the St. Regis Indians.

In 1764, Mr. Samuel Kirkland, a graduate of Nassau Hall, or New Jersey College, and a son of a Congregational minister of Norwich, Con., after completing his studies for the ministry, entered the country of the Senecas, with the pious view of learning their language and instructing them in Christianity. He travelled on snowshoes two hundred and fifty miles, in the depth of winter, and through the wilderness, carrying his provisions on his back, with two Indian guides for companions. In seventeen days he reached a town called Kanasada, and was kindly received by the Indians. After surmounting various difficulties, and having his life threatened, he came back to his native State for aid. In May, 1766, Mr. Kirkland returned to the Indian country, accompanied by two or three other missionaries and teachers from the Indian school of the Rev. Dr. Wheelock, in Lebanon, Con., and fixed his station among the Oneidas, in the town of Kanonwarhare. A school had already been established, and the Indians were desirous for a minister. He soon obtained from them a pledge to abandon the use of intoxicating drinks, and in an Indian council held on the subject, eight principal men were appointed to aid him in destroying all spirituous liquors. These men proved faithful in the work; and such was the success of the measure that, some few weeks after, eighty casks of rum were carried through the town and offered for sale, and even in some instances as presents, yet none were persuaded to accept. For a period of three months, only two persons were guilty of intoxication, and one of these was the only person who opposed, in council, the measures of Mr. Kirkland. And yet, this early laborer in temperance reform, in advanced life became himself a victim to intoxicating drinks! The next year, both the missionary and the Indians suffered much from famine and sickness.

By 1770, this mission assumed a promising aspect; the Lord's day was observed with strictness, intoxication was very rare, and many individuals were hopefully converted. In 1773, the Society in Scotland for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, in conjunction with the Corporation of Harvard University, took Mr. Kirkland under patronage and sustained him.

The American revolutionary war rolled back the tide

of civilization. Sir William Johnson, the British colonial agent for the Iroquois, ordered all "dissenting" missionaries to leave the Indian country. During the war, Mr. Kirkland could only make occasional visits, at much hazard; but after the war, the Oneidas made a grant of land to all Indians of different nations who would settle in their country, listen to the word of God, and cultivate the arts of civilized life. In their "talk" to Mr. Kirkland, whom they urged to return, they say,—

"We have been attending for many years to the vast difference between white people and Indians. We have labored much to investigate the cause; for the one are in prosperous circumstances, the other are indigent and wretched. The one appear to be the favorites of Heaven, and honorable in the sight of men; the other, to be despised and rejected of both. We Indians, therefore, must alter our conduct. We must give up our pagan customs. We must unite, with all our wisdom and strength, to cultivate the manners and civilization of the white people, who are thus distinguished by the favor and protection of the Great Spirit above, and embrace the religion of Christ, or we shall, for many years, be not only despised by the nations of the earth, but utterly rejected by the Lord Jesus, the Saviour of the white people.

"We entreat our Father to make one trial more for Christianizing the Indians, at least for one, if not for two years; and if there be no encouragement after this, that we shall be built up as a people and embrace the religion of Christ, he may leave us, and we shall expect nothing but ruin."

In 1785, we find Mr. Kirkland again seated among the Oneidas, instructing them, and preaching the gospel with success. The war and other influences had diminished their numbers and damaged their morals. Intemperance again prevailed. But in a short period after missionary labors were resumed, a great change was effected. The Oneidas came many miles to public worship; order, attention and solemnity appeared in their meetings, and the mighty agency of the Holy Spirit attended the ministry of the word. At one time, upwards of seventy persons were under serious impressions.

At a subsequent period this people again degenerated. Idleness, intemperance and kindred vices to a considerable extent blasted these hopeful prospects. The tide of emigration brought a class of white people into the country, whose example and influence were by no means favorable to Indian reform. In 1796, the Rev. Drs. Morse and Belknap, by an appointment of the Society in Scotland

for the Propagation of Knowledge, visited the Oneida country to inquire into the state of the mission. They found under the pastoral charge of the Rev. Mr. Kirkland, including men, women and children, six hundred and twenty-eight souls, about thirty of whom were hopefully pious and communicants in the church. But the state of morals in the nation was lax, and a large proportion had become intemperate; and what was worse, the occasional irregularity of the missionary, in this respect, was not likely to produce reform! His zeal, self-denial, piety, benevolence and activity in former years, had afforded the highest gratification. Alas, for frail human nature! He had fallen from his noble and elevated position in the temperance cause! His health was on the decline, and two years after he was disabled from public duties. Subsequently he recovered his health, and in some measure his character for sobriety and usefulness; and after having spent forty years of his life as a missionary among the Indians, he died at Paris, Oneida County, March 18, 1808, aged sixty-five years. The mission was continued by the appointment of the Rev. Mr. Jenkins, who labored with some success.

Within the bounds of the Oneida nation, and in political alliance, but under a distinct mission, were the Stockbridge Indians. The mission is noticed in this place, both from its locality and the reflex influence it had on the Oneidas. These people originated from the Mohegan branch of the Algonkin race. The mission was commenced by the Rev. John Sergeant, in 1734, on the Housatonic river in Berkshire county, Mass. The tribe were called *River* Indians; but subsequently were known by the name of Stockbridge. A congregation and school were gathered, and the missionary taught them the truths of Christianity, agriculture and some mechanical trades. Mr. Sergeant was sustained in his philanthropic labors by Mr. Hollis, a wealthy Baptist of London, the founder of the Hollis Professorships in Harvard University. He provided for the education of twelve Indian youths, and afterwards doubled the number. Mr. Sergeant died in 1749, at the age of thirty-nine. "For brightness of genius, extensive learning, deep piety, untiring benevolence, a tender conscience, and unwearied diligence, he was not excelled."

His successor, who had aided him as a teacher, was a Mr. Woodbridge, who conducted the school and mission for a time, and who was followed in his labors by the distinguished Jonathan Edwards, who took charge of the mission in 1751, and labored in it for about six years. He toiled prayerfully and diligently, but with little success. It was in this secluded spot that he wrote his masterly treatises on the Freedom of the Will, and on Original Sin.

During the war of 1755—63, between Great Britain and the colonies on the one part, and France and the Canada Indians on the other, this mission, as has been the case with all Indian missions in war, was much injured. The Stockbridge and the Mohawk Indians were in alliance, and fought on the side of the colonies; many were killed and others scattered abroad.

At a subsequent period, the mission was under charge of Mr. John Sergeant, a son of the founder of the mission. The revolutionary war again broke up the mission; but it was revived in the Oneida country, and a village established and called New Stockbridge. The famous Samson Occum, an educated Indian preacher, removed from Connecticut, with the Indians under his charge, to the Oneida country, where he preached to the Stockbridge and other Mohegan Indians till his death, which took place at Brotherton, N. Y., in July, 1792; his age was sixty-nine years.

The next removal of these Indians was to White river, in Indiana, and from thence to the country of Greenbay in Wisconsin. More recently a portion of the band have gone to the Indian Territory, west of the State of Missouri, and will be soon followed by the remainder. They have long since abandoned the chase, and become a Christianized and civilized people. The mission, through its various stages, was Pædobaptist; yet within a few years many of this band have adopted Baptist principles, and a prosperous Baptist church is in the tribe.

The intelligence of the formation of the London Missionary Society in 1795, and the sending out of a large number of missionaries to the South Sea Islands, awakened a missionary spirit among the Presbyterians and Baptists in the city of New York, which, after mutual consultation, resulted in the organization of the New York

Missionary Society, with the special object of sending the gospel to the Indians.

Their first missionary was the Rev. Elkanah Holmes, a venerable Baptist minister in that vicinity. Mr. Holmes, with his self-denying and pious wife, though nearly three score years of age, soon departed for a residence among the Indians in Tuscarora village, near the present site of Buffalo. They were received with kindness and treated with respect. This mission began about the year 1801. The venerable chief of the tribe was named Sacharisa; the next in command was William Printup. The principal interpreter, and who, at a later period, was elected chief, was Nicholas Cusick, of whom it is necessary we should give some particulars.

Mr. Cusick was born in the Mohawk Valley in 1758; his father was a white man, his mother a full-blooded Tuscarora. He received a good English education at Johnson Hall, through the patronage and liberality of Sir William Johnson, heretofore noticed as a distinguished British officer, and colonial agent for the Six Nations, and who died suddenly in 1774. His son and successor, Sir John Johnson, commanded the larger part of the warriors of the Six Nations in the American revolution, and became a terrible scourge to the settlements along the valley of the Mohawk. He made liberal offers to Nicholas Cusick to unite with him and command the Tuscaroras; but he refused, attached himself with about fifty Tuscaroras to the fortunes of Washington, and distinguished himself on the side of the Americans. He had previously been acquainted with the missionary Kirkland, heard the gospel preached, and became impressed with its truths. After the war he returned to the mission station among the Oneidas, and professed religion by joining the church. Of course he was a Pædobaptist, and so continued till near the close of life. He married a native Tuscarora, settled with his people near Buffalo, was a praying man, and maintained an honorable Christian profession. It was his influence that led Father Holmes to the village. Cusick became a zealous and efficient coadjutor; not only interpreting his discourses with great fluency and accuracy, but by his affectionate addresses in public and private contributing to the success of the mission.

Whoever has a file of the "Massachusetts Baptist Mis-

sionary Magazine," from 1804 to 1808, will find several interesting communications on this mission. At that period the Shaftsbury Baptist Association, now nearly extinct, and the Massachusetts Baptist Missionary Society, each sent exploring missionaries into the north-western wilderness. Amongst these were the Rev. Caleb Blood, Lemuel Covell and David Irish. In the autumn of 1802, Mr. Blood, under an appointment from the Shaftsbury Association, made an excursion into Upper Canada, recrossed the Niagara river and visited the Tuscaroras. He found Mr. Holmes in a "log hut, three and a half miles from the village." The following sketch from his report deserves a reprint.

"I crossed into the wilderness on this side, and after climbing a precipice of rocks, found a kind of house made of rough logs. Here I found Elder Holmes, missionary to the Indians. He was sitting at a kind of table, writing on the business of the mission. If you could paint to yourself how you should feel in a dreary wilderness, hundreds of miles from any brethren in the ministry to advise with, and your soul filled with concern to disseminate light among the poor heathen, and a number of councils to hold with different nations, and no mortal to assist you but an Indian interpreter, you may guess what a meeting we had! We soon went on three miles and a half to the Tuscarora village of Indians, and held a council with that nation, and obtained our answer to a 'talk' sent them from the New York Missionary Society, on the subject of their receiving the gospel. I suppose you have seen it in the publications of that society, otherwise I should have sent it with this letter. This council was on Saturday. I tarried with Mr. Holmes and attended worship with the Indians on the Sabbath. After worship in the evening, he stated to me the circumstances of his business with the Indians, and wished my assistance. I agreed to spend some time with him; and accordingly attended three days with the Indians; Mr. Holmes being otherwise employed. The Indians were very attentive, and the interpreter [Cusick] appeared very pious and faithful. I did not find the difficulty in preaching by an interpreter that I expected. Indeed, to see the poor creatures in such profound ignorance, and yet attentive to hear instruction, I must say, absorbed all my feelings, beyond any other preaching ever attempted in my life."

After this, Mr. Blood spent two weeks in company with Elder Holmes, among the Senecas. The following remarks appear in his journal.

"These are thought to be the most savage of any of the Six Nations, and have therefore utterly refused to receive missionaries. The Grand Council of the Six Nations met while I was there. I was ad-

mitted with Elder Holmes to attend the Council, which continued four days. Our interpreter informed us what they were doing. They had business on different subjects, and among others to consult whether they would follow the dictates of their prophets, or receive the gospel : for in the Alleghany nation a prophet had arisen up, who professed to be immediately inspired by the Great Spirit to teach the people. He taught some good morals, just enough to answer the purpose of Satan to blind the poor creatures. He then urges the necessity of all their pagan worship. It has been the practice of this nation once a year to sacrifice two dogs to the Great Spirit. With this sacrifice they offer a kind of incense made of compounded spicy herbs, dried and pulverized, which are thrown into the fire, a little at a time, while the dogs are burning. They close the scene by a festival, and spend the night in dancing. The young warriors are generally pleased with the prophet, and love those high dances."

Rev. James C. Cusick confirms this statement about the prophet, and says he was called Toho-nya-da-hi, or "The Beautiful Lake"; that he professed to have had a dream, in which, as he said afterwards, he went to hell, and the Great Spirit showed him how drunken Indians were punished—by pouring melted lead down their throats;—that he went to heaven, saw Jesus Christ, who said he had nothing to do with Indians—that the white people had killed him, and they, and not the Indians were to be saved by him. His lectures produced a great reformation amongst the Indians in temperance. They quit the use of "fire water" in many instances. Such prophets have been common amongst the Indians, and it is a curious fact that their imaginary interviews with the Great Spirit impress them with the horrible effects of the use of "fire water," and they turn temperance reformers. Some of these instances, as in the history of the Shawanese prophet at Tippecanoe, afford evidence that their prophetic visions result from the delirium tremens, after a period of intoxication.

Mr. Blood speaks highly of Red Jacket, and says that "great exertions were made in the council to depose him from his office as sachem, because he was in favor of receiving the gospel, and would not submit to the dictates of the prophet." He held his place by the influence of a majority. Eventually Red Jacket became the advocate and leader of the pagan party, and lived and died a strong advocate of Indian rights and customs. Mr. Blood gives an account of an Indian meeting held by the prophet, and the effect of his instructions.

"Their zeal went to great extremes, and there were such hideous yells interspersed with their devotions, as would have effectually tried my courage, if my interpreter had not been there to inform me what they meant."

From the Senecas, Mr. B. went in company with Elder Holmes to the Tonawanda village, but from the absence of the chiefs no council was held. The next year, 1803, the Shaftsbury Association sent two missionaries to the west, Elders Warren and Covell, who visited Long Point in Upper Canada, baptized thirty persons, and formed a church. During the same tour, Elder Covell visited the Tuscaroras and preached several times, Mr. Cusick being still the interpreter. In December, 1805, Elder Holmes writes to the late Rev. William Collier, then pastor of the little Baptist church in Charlestown, Mass., from Tuscarora village. He gives a distressing account of the dissipation, profaneness and general immorality of the white people in western New York and Canada,—mentions several whites and a considerable number of Indians who were seriously affected with the gospel, states that he was sixty-two years of age at that time, and says,—

"I have not been absent from the Indians in this place but one Sabbath since August, 1803, and that day my pulpit was supplied by our worthy and esteemed brother, Elder Covell."

The mission among the Tuscaroras, through the arduous and self-denying labors of Father Holmes, continued to afford promise of success. He broke up the fallow ground, cast in the seed of divine truth, and looked up to heaven with earnest supplications for the earlier and latter rains to cause it to germinate.

In 1805 we again find Elder Covell on this missionary field, in company with Elder David Irish. We copy from his journal, dated October 10, 1805.

"I rode to the Tuscarora village, where to my great joy I found our worthy friend and brother, Elder Elkanah Holmes, and his worthy spouse, in health, and much rejoiced to see me arrive safely at their hospitable home. I spent about a week at the village, and in the white settlements adjacent; preaching a number of sermons to the white people, and two to the Indians. I was joyfully received by the sachems of the nation, and by the greatest part of their people. Had several very agreeable conferences with the nation at large, besides several with their chief men by themselves. I delivered them a written

talk from our Association, and received the promise that they would send an answer on my return."

After performing his customary tour in Upper Canada, Elder Covell returned to Tuscarora in December, and continued preaching and holding council for one month. The Indians sent a written "talk" to the Association, signed by the old chief Sacharisa, and William Printup, by appending the X to their names. Mr. Covell says at this visit,—

"I found this nation much improved since I visited them two years ago; and I have solid reason to believe that their chief sachem [Sacharisa] and some others have experienced a saving change of heart. Not far from one hundred of them are pretty constant attendants at public worship; and I never preached to a more orderly assembly of people, of any color, in my life. They hear with attention, and behave with the utmost decency. Their singing is performed with melody and harmony. They are very orderly and decent in their behavior on the first day of the week. The most of them have left off the use of spirituous liquors; and they adhere to the rules of temperance with the utmost scrupulosity. Some of them are making considerable progress in agriculture; but this is not general. There is an English school taught amongst them, at which their children attend, and learn reading and writing.

The worthy Elder writes in the strongest terms of the zeal, fidelity and success of the venerable Holmes. Covell died at Clinton, in Upper Canada, October 19, 1806, while on a missionary tour. The labors of Elder Holmes were continued with the Tuscaroras for a year or two longer, when he was discharged from the service of the Society, and the mission passed into the charge of a Presbyterian. On this point we have no documents at hand; but our impression is that a difficulty arose as to the character of the church about to be formed, and the rites to be observed amongst the converts. We have already stated that the society that sustained Mr. Holmes was a union between Presbyterians and Baptists, a sort of "Evangelical Alliance" on a small scale. Neither party were expected to relinquish any conscientious, and in their judgment, scriptural principle. Mr. Holmes was a strict, conscientious Baptist, and could use no substitutes for the laws of Christ. The members of the society agreed to divide, and the Baptist section formed the New York Baptist Missionary Society, which took Elder Holmes under

its patronage, and continued him an itinerant missionary in the destitute white settlements along the Hudson river. A small Pædobaptist church was formed amongst the Tuscaroras, of which Nicholas Cusick was a conspicuous member, and, if we mistake not, William Printup was an elder or deacon. This mission was commenced by the New York Missionary Society in 1801, and in 1821, transferred to the United Foreign Missionary Society, and to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in 1826.

Elder James C. Cusick, known as a Baptist missionary, and the compiler of the hymn book placed at the head of this article, was a son of Nicholas Cusick, was converted in early life, and joined the Pædobaptist mission church about 1823, in which he sustained an honorable relation, and commenced preaching and exhorting the Tuscaroras about 1830. His Presbyterian brethren sent him to an academy at Lewistown, N. Y., preparatory to a regular induction into the ministry. He boarded with a Baptist deacon by the name of Furman, with whom he held frequent conversations on baptism; Cusick being much opposed to the peculiar tenets of the Baptists. The deacon showed him the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. This attracted his attention. He read carefully all the Epistles in the Mohawk language. At first he doubted; then believed, and in 1833, was baptized in company with William Printup, by Elder Andrus, in the Niagara river. Other members soon followed, a Baptist church was formed, and in 1839 the venerable chief, Nicholas Cusick, was baptized at the age of eighty-one. James C. Cusick was ordained to the ministry in June 1838, by the Rev. Messrs. Caldicott, Irons and Andrus.

The Tuscaroras are now a civilized people and nearly all Baptists, so far as they are professors of religion. About 100 are members of a church in Canada West, with a Mr. Lantern for their pastor, and including those who remain in New York, and those who, with Rev. James C. Cusick, have removed to the Indian Territory west of the Mississippi, there are in the United States between forty and fifty Baptist communicants. Holmes, and Blood, and Covell, and Irish, and Warren, and their interpreter, Nicholas Cusick, and Deacon Printup, and nearly every manager and member, both of the New

York Missionary Society and the Shaftsbury Association have gone to the church above; but the seed they have sown in weakness, and watered with many tears, has become a tree, and spread its branches along Grand river in Canada, and the far distant plains of Missouri.

J. M. P.

Rock Spring, Ill.

ARTICLE VII.

MIRACLES.

Real Dialogues on the Evidences of Christianity. By a Clergyman of the Church of England.

Question Book on the Miracles of our Saviour Jesus Christ. By REV. LEMUEL PORTER.

IS THE PERFORMANCE OF A MIRACLE PROOF OF A DIVINE COMMISSION TO REVEAL TRUTH?

In order to reply understandingly to this inquiry, it is necessary first to solve another question, viz.—*Can any other being than God perform a miracle?* If no other being can perform a miracle, then it is a sufficient evidence of the divine commission of him by whose hand it is done. But if, on the contrary, another being can work miracles, then no occurrence of this nature can be adduced to evince the divine origin of any doctrine. From an effect which can be produced by a great variety of causes, we cannot infer what cause, in any given instance, has been at work. We shall consider separately both of these alternatives.

On the hypothesis that other beings, beside the Deity, can perform miracles, such events as an evidence of divine mission, would be of no value. This, however, is not admitted by those who advocate this side of the question. For, say they, though a miracle in itself considered is no proof that the individual by whom it was wrought

acted under divine authority, yet the event may be accompanied by such circumstances as may render it abundantly manifest by whose authority he did act. Thus much may be admitted, that since ignorance and credulity are so liable to be imposed upon by designing men, the character of the professed miracle, the attendant circumstances, and the object for which it was wrought, are legitimate tests which may be employed to ascertain whether the occurrence was actually a miracle or a feat of legerdemain. It is not to be supposed that the Deity will ever interpose, either in a manner, or for an object unworthy of his infinite majesty, purity and goodness. We do not, however, believe, that all men are in any case, or that any man is, in all cases, competent to judge what is befitting the Divinity. Still, on these grounds, we may very profitably compare the miracles recorded in the Bible with the pretended heathen and popish miracles. These characteristics can avail only to distinguish the true from the false, the real from the merely apparent.

If other beings than God can work real miracles, have we any means to distinguish the divine from the angelic or demoniacal? In a book entitled, "*Real Dialogues on the Evidences of Christianity*." By a Clergyman of the Church of England; and in "*The Question Book on the Miracles of our Saviour Jesus Christ*." By Rev. Lemuel Porter," it is maintained that the devil may work, and actually has worked miracles. These authors, however, affirm that we may distinguish between the divine and the Satanic. The criterion, according to them, by which the distinction can be made, is this: the purity, or the opposite, of the moral precepts inculcated by the messenger. If his precepts are holy and consonant to our natural perceptions, then his miracles are wrought by the power of God. But if the precepts are impure and revolting to our natural sense of right, then the messenger performs his miracles by the power of Beelzebub.

Let it be admitted, for the present, that Satan can perform miracles. If by the rule proposed, the discrimination can be made, miracles will still remain, but with a greatly diminished force, as evidences of a divine commission to reveal truth;—with a diminished force, we say, because their power is no longer inherent, but borrowed from the moral precepts which accompany them.

Other things being equal, the shorter and more direct an argument is, the greater is its power to convince. To ordinary minds, an argument will be weaker in proportion to its circuitousness. But if neither this rule, nor any other that can be devised, can be safely employed for such a purpose, then all the evidence for the truth of Christianity derived from miracles is irreclaimably lost.

We dare not say that, if miracles can be performed by different powers, other criteria than the one recommended by the authors above mentioned, may not be found. But we have not been able to conceive of any other equally plausible. Let us then put this rule in the balance. Our opinion is, that it is found decidedly wanting. Our reasons for it are the following.

1. This rule ascribes far too much to the knowledge and moral culture of mankind. It supposes that men already, before any revelation established by miracles is made known to them, are in possession of a perfect system of morals, or a system indefinitely approaching perfection; and that they have already a clear and keen sense of right. The hypothesis under consideration proceeds on the supposition that men, before they can receive any doctrine as divine truth, are in possession of such a system of moral truths, and of such a moral character as can result only from a lively belief of divine doctrines.

One distinction usually made between precepts and doctrines is, that the first are discoverable by the light of nature, and the second are not. The propriety of this statement is admitted. Yet there is an immeasurable difference between a thing being discoverable, and its being actually discovered. However legibly the moral precepts have been written on the pages of nature, and however brightly the light has shone upon them, the eyes of humanity have been too much obscured to read them to any good purpose. In all departments of human labor, discoverers and originators have been extremely few. If, in this respect, the moral science is an exception, it is so in such a way as not at all to favor the advocates of the hypothesis in question. If it be true that man is fallen, that he is depraved, must he not be by nature peculiarly incapable of discovering moral truth? And must he not, when it has been discovered by others, be extremely slow to assent to it? We do not deny that a few of the an-

cient heathen sages stumbled on some grand, but most obvious moral truths. But it is incontrovertible that of moral obligation, properly speaking, they had hardly any idea. Their discoveries in this department were considered by themselves rather as fruitful subjects of speculation, than as laws of practical utility. Such truths were not known to them as parts of a grand system, binding on the conscience and involving the eternal destiny of the human race. Along with these truths, the best and wisest of the heathen held a multitude of errors, which rendered them utterly unproductive of good.

If moral precepts are discoverable by reason, it is by reason only as it appears in the exceedingly small number of the great and good, who had received a diploma of nobility from nature herself. The mass of men might breathe and dream here for millions of ages, without making a single discovery. Aside from revelation, the most obvious moral principles, so far as the multitude are concerned, derive all their authority from the philosophers who announce them. They have no penetration to perceive absolute fitness, nor the disinterestedness to be governed by the idea of general utility, even if they could be made to comprehend what would be for the general good. The very few sages of whom heathenism can boast, made nothing visible but themselves, unless it be said that they made the surrounding darkness visible. There may have been a solitary exception. Socrates seems to have had some living faith in the truths which were then known. He labored to diffuse a knowledge of them. But so far were the mass of the people from having any intuitive perception of the heavenly nature of his precepts, that they condemned him to death as a corrupter of youth.

Where, then, can the performer of miracles obtain competent judges to examine his moral precepts, and to pronounce a righteous sentence in regard to them? Can he trust his cause in the hands of those who sit in darkness, and eat iniquity as they would bread? Have such persons any guide, either external or internal, to direct them in judgment? Is man naturally and always inclined to ascribe absolute perfection to the supreme Divinity? Did not the great mass of the Greeks and Romans, especially in the most ancient portion of their history, believe in the

supreme godhead of Jupiter? And is it possible for a being to be more impure than the oldest and best known poets represent him to be? As men have always clothed the object of their worship with their own passions, whence can they have such a conception of the attributes of the most high God, that by the character of his laws they can readily distinguish between his miracles and those of Satan? Is not the description in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans true both of the ancient and modern heathen? Can such people have a proper standard of morals, to test correctly the precepts of a performer of miracles and teacher of doctrines?

But it may be said, "We are not heathen; nor were the Jews, in the time of the Messiah, heathen. Had they not a proper moral standard? Could they not rightly decide in reference to the precepts of a pretended divine messenger?" Admit all this; what then? How came they by such a standard of morals? Whence did they derive such power to judge of precepts? The answer is obvious. They had been in a course of preparation for two thousand years. The system of instruction which they had enjoyed during such a period was originally founded in miracles. We have no reason to suppose, that, when Moses was sent to them—to go no farther back—they had either such knowledge, or such internal sense as would qualify them to decide rightly in reference to moral precepts.

Possibly there never have been any people, who had not some correct notions of moral laws. But in the absence of revelation, their knowledge has invariably been confined to a few of the most obvious principles; such as the *golden rule*, so called. Were a divine messenger to impart a systematic course of instruction, the first few principles previously known, would furnish by far too narrow a foundation for such a superstructure as he would labor to build. He would be under the necessity of ascending to more abstruse questions, where he would have to encounter immemorial prescriptions, and the most deeply rooted prejudices. In such a case, so far would his moral precepts be from operating in his favor, that from them would arise the chief obstacles to his progress. If the precepts of the religious teacher tended obviously and immediately to the promotion of what the people con-

sidered as their chief interest, they would vociferously profess an unshaken belief in their divinity. But should they demand the immediate abandonment of what were deemed profit and pleasure, nothing but an overpowering evidence that they were from God could save them from being spitefully rejected.

Suppose a temperance apostle had been commissioned, fifty years ago, to New England. Suppose that he passed through the land, proclaiming to great and small, "To drink distilled spirit and fermented liquors as common beverages is a grievous sin against God," and then performed many undoubted miracles. As miracles are equivocal in their character, we may imagine a council of wise men convened to examine the credentials of the pretended apostle. "That this man," they say, "has performed notable miracles, none of us can deny. But as the emissaries of Satan, as well as the special messengers of God, can work these wonders, the question now is, whence has this man derived his authority? Let him be fairly tried according to the law. What are his moral precepts? Are they consonant to our views and feelings? Nay, they contradict all experience. Every creature of God is good, when properly used. To think it possible for a man to ward off the evil effects of a changeable climate, and to undergo necessary toil without liquor, is absurd in the extreme. Our most godly men use it. According to the most tried orthodoxy, excess alone is sinful. As to wine, we need only to allude to the transaction in Cana of Galilee. Our judgment, therefore, is that the morals which this pretended apostle teaches are dangerous; and in consequence, he works miracles by the power of Satan." We ask, whether, under the views that prevailed fifty years ago, such would not have been the legitimate operation of the rule proposed?

2. The rule under consideration ascribes far too little to Satan. It proceeds on the hypothesis that the evil one would immediately betray his true character; that he could not act the hypocrite; that by his moral precepts he would at once expose his cloven foot. Have there not been men, who, by a pretence of goodness, carried on with singular consistency for a long time, completely deceived virtuous individuals to their great injury? They placed their ample morals in bold relief, and under their

shadow worked the ruin of their unsuspecting victims. Were they at the outset openly to profess the principles by which they guided their conduct, they would at once defeat their purpose. But by looking one way and rowing the other way, they successfully accomplished their designs.

Is not the Old Serpent as cunning as his human children? Can he not disguise himself like an angel of light? Is he always as barefaced as the hypothesis under consideration indicates? If human knaves can loudly boast of their lofty morality, cannot Satan do the same?

No people, whatever may have been true of rare individuals, have, in the absence of light from heaven, advanced in their knowledge of moral law beyond the first and most obvious principles. In their acquaintance with commutative justice, the ancient Romans were by no means deficient. But we speak of what is pure and light in a religious sense. No people ever had such notions of the supreme God as to enable them with any degree of certainty to recognize the imprint of his attributes in the things which proceed from him. So obscure and so loose were their ideas, that pretended divine commands, the most unjust and impure, did not shock them. Under such circumstances as these, all that a prophet of Satan would need, in order to place himself forever beyond the possibility of detection, would be to profess his belief in the exceedingly few moral truths known, while in the vast field that lies beyond these infant steps, he might take what direction he pleased. Is the fallen archangel not equal to such a simple management as this?

Suppose the moral laws of God would, if known, prove fatal to the reign of Satan,—cannot he place them in such relations as to annul their effect? The Pharisees, whom our Saviour denominated the brood of the viper, did not blot out the commandments. They professed a great regard for the law. But they made the whole of none effect through their glosses and traditions. If the pure law of God should prove the bane of Satan's authority, might he not learn wisdom from the conduct of his children, and make such a compound of law and tradition as might prove the elixir of immortality to his sovereign power? It may be, after all, that the completely neutralizing power of tradition is an original discovery of his

own. But has Satan so much reason to dread the operation of the law as our hypothesis indicates? Have pure moral precepts always proved the death of sin? Has the law in itself a mighty reclaiming efficacy? Far from it. In proper combination with the gospel, its power is immense. But what is it alone? Let Paul reply,—“The law entered that the offence might abound.” “Sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment which was ordained unto life, I found to be unto death. For sin taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me.” Is this law, then, when detached from other truths, such a mighty opponent to the reign of Satan? Yea, even in this holy law, may he not find a powerful auxiliary? A guilty conscience, when there is no knowledge of the blood of the cross, is extremely liable to become desperate.

It is, we believe, an acknowledged fact, that the ballads and songs of a nation contribute far more largely to the formation of their character than their laws. It is at least an established truth, that the reformatory power is in the gospel. “The letter killeth, but the Spirit maketh alive.” The chief interest of the kingdom of darkness does not consist so much in corrupting the precepts of morality, as the doctrines of grace. And does it not seem, both from history and what we witness around us, that the chief energy and cunning of the grand enemy ever have been, and still are directed almost exclusively to corrupting the doctrines? When Christianity is deeply obscured, men speedily lose their interest in the moral law; they soon lose sight of its spirituality, extent and sanctions, and become proud and hopeless formalists—the most efficient tools of Satan.

3. The rule under consideration limits the Almighty. For it renders it necessary that his messengers, in all instances, should make a formal confession of their moral creed. It never can be sufficient that the revealer of his will should barely announce his message and perform a miracle in proof of his divine commission. He must also repeat the decalogue, or a summary of it, in order to evince that it is not by Beelzebub that he works miracles.

If, then, the hypothesis under consideration be correct, and the rule in question be well founded, it follows that the Lord took the most effectual way to harden the heart of Pharaoh and to prepare him for destruction. For Moses was not commanded to deliver a moral disquisition before the Egyptian monarch. His message was brief. "The God of the Hebrews saith, Let my people go." He cast down his rod; and it became a serpent. How could Pharaoh decide who was the author of this miracle,—whether the supreme God, or the arch-apostate? Moses did not state moral maxims, and then draw from them the inference that slavery was wrong. He employed no argument but simply this—"Thus saith Jehovah, the God of the Hebrews." But the requisition made upon the king was a violation of what was then, and for many years afterwards, universally considered as an undisputed right. So far, therefore, was the Lord from giving Pharaoh a proof that he had sent Moses, that he placed him in such a position that he would certainly draw the wrong inference, provided he judged by the rule under consideration.

Jeroboam is another case in point. As he was burning incense in Bethel, a man of God came out of Judah, and predicted to him a future event, and performed a miracle as an evidence of the truth of his prophecy. But we do not find that the prophet made any declaration of his moral principles. Jeroboam, therefore, must have been left in doubt, whether the man was a prophet of Jehovah or an emissary of Satan.

If both God and Satan can perform miracles, and these are to be distinguished from each other by the moral precepts which accompany them, it would be indispensable that the divine messenger should invariably make a declaration of his moral sentiments. This would especially be the case, when the revelations he was about to make would apparently conflict with the known commandments of God, and would actually conflict with the notions of right entertained by the people to whom the revelation was about to be made. If a miracle in itself is not a sufficient evidence of a divine commission, how could Moses demonstrate that the command to destroy utterly the Canaanites came from Him who said, "Thou shalt not kill"? Suppose God had sent a prophet to command Abraham

to sacrifice his son, and had empowered him to perform a miracle as an evidence of his mission, could Abraham believe on such a doubtful ground, when the thing commanded was contrary to the promise of God, and in itself, to all appearance, so unjust and cruel?

4. The Bible no where intimates that real miracles are an insufficient proof of a divine commission to reveal truth. If such an evidence had been inadequate, we should expect express warnings in reference to this subject in the New Testament. For we are told that the Jews sought after a sign. This was the proof that they required, in order that one might be received as a divine prophet. It was neither wisdom nor morality that they sought, but a miracle. Hence the dilemma of Annas, the high priest, and his kindred, when Peter and John healed a cripple at the beautiful gate of the temple. They were exceedingly enraged, and believed, or at least professed to believe, that the teaching of the apostles was subversive of the revelations which God had made by Moses. Still, seeing the boldness of unlettered men, and the person who had been healed standing with them, they could say nothing against it. When they had put the apostles out, they said, "What shall we do to these men? for that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them, is manifest to all them that dwell in Jerusalem, and we cannot deny it." It will surely avail nothing to say that the apostles taught nothing contrary to the moral law. For precepts are selected as a criterion of the divinity of miracles, simply on the ground that in reference to them reason can judge what is true and what is false. Though beforehand we cannot tell what is true or what is false in doctrine, yet where it has once been revealed, we can know with as much certainty what is true in doctrine, as what is pure in precept. Suppose that now miracles are performed both through the power of God and that of other beings, we can as safely and as lawfully employ doctrines as discriminating tests, as moral precepts. Were one to teach that forgiveness is not derived through the death of Christ, we should know as certainly that he was not of God, as if he had taught, Hate your enemies: return evil for evil.

If a rule had ever been given, or ever been employed in order to judge of miracles, the perplexity of the priests,

on the occasion just referred to, would be almost as wonderful as the cure of the lame man. It is true that Moses speaks of a prophet, who might perform signs and wonders in order to entice the people to idolatry. Deut. 13: 1. If he made the supposition that an impostor might perform real miracles for the purpose of corrupting the true religion, why did not the priests, in the case of Peter and John, avail themselves of it? For they might with great plausibility show that the apostles were turning away the people from the religion of their fathers. Was it not said on another occasion, that they taught customs which they, as Jews, could not lawfully observe? But the passage in Deuteronomy, and others of like nature, had never been so understood. Moses, who was learned in all the wisdom of Egypt, and who had encountered the sorcery of Jannes and Jambres, was well aware that such characters might easily impose on men ignorant of natural laws and of legerdemain. In the estimation of a people in the then condition of the Hebrews, most experiments in chemistry and natural philosophy would be miracles.

What importance the Jews, in the time of the Messiah, attributed to the evidence furnished directly by miracles, we may learn from the confession of Nicodemus. "Rabbi," said he, "we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." According to Dr. Robinson's *Harmony of the Gospels*, the only miracle recorded which Christ had performed previous to this conversation with Nicodemus, was the turning of the water into wine;—unless the casting out of the traders from the temple may be so denominated. We are not informed that previous to this time the character of the Saviour as a teacher, had become widely known. There is no intimation given that this Jewish counsellor had ever heard him or heard of his doctrine. He was fully persuaded of the divine mission of Jesus, and his conviction, according to his own statement, arose solely from the miracles which had been performed. If miracles could be wrought by any other than divine power, should we not expect that such a teacher as Jesus would hasten to expose the uncertainty of the evidence which had produced conviction in the mind of this master in Israel? Would he not have

reflected—"this great and ingenuous man is completely at the mercy of the devil? He relies, without any suspicion of danger, on miracles, as a proof of a divine mission. How dangerous his position. Though I may now make some good impressions on his mind, as soon as he leaves me, he may meet with some emissary of Satan who may perform miracles before him, and then his principle leads him unerringly to ruin. Shall I not deal honestly with him, and put him on his guard?" But nothing of this nature do we find. The silence of the Saviour implies that so far Nicodemus was standing on a firm foundation.

This is not all. The Lord Jesus, in several instances, appealed directly to his miracles, exclusive of every accompanying circumstance, as a proof that he had come from God. "But I have greater witness than that of John; the works which the Father has given me to finish, the same works that I do bear witness of me, that the Father has sent me." "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him." How can any thing be more to the purpose than this passage? Does he not expressly appeal from his oral instructions to his miracles, as from a less to a more conclusive, or, at least, more tangible testimony? If the hypothesis we oppose be correct, should we not expect the passage to run thus: "If you do not believe from these miracles, that I have come from the Father, I refer you to my discourse on the mount, and I ask you, can one that hath a devil inculcate such morals?" But this would be reversing our Saviour's process; making that the proof, which with him was the proposition. Again. "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin; but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father." In this passage, as in the preceding, there is a distinct recognition of the entire adequacy of miracles, as a proof of divine mission. There is no where the least intimation of a necessity to refer to the precepts.

If we are not mistaken, we have arrived legitimately at the conclusion, that if other beings than God can perform miracles, properly so called, we have no means by which

we can certainly distinguish between the divine and the Satanic, and the Scriptures give us no intimation of the necessity of any such means.

The second question proposed is, *Can other beings beside God perform miracles?* In reply we would state,—

I. The decision of this question is not affected by the moral character of the agent. We are not disposed to deny that ungodly men may have performed miracles. Judas was one of the twelve, when Jesus sent them forth with authority to cast out demons and heal diseases. It is not, indeed, stated expressly that the traitor wrought miracles; yet the presumption is that he did. Why should he not? He was clothed with the same power, and from the same source, as the remainder of them. Referring to the final judgment, Jesus said, "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?" No intimation is given that the plea here is supposed false. The individuals themselves must have been persuaded that they had performed real miracles. But in so doing, they had acted under the authority of Christ. It is true that usually it was his own peculiar people that God clothed with supernatural powers. If he has, on particular occasions, employed other instruments, it does not follow that such individuals derived their extraordinary endowments from angels or demons. To predict future events, and to work miracles, are not the legitimate functions of personal piety. It is one thing to say, that God may at times employ wicked men to reveal the future, or to exhibit superhuman phenomena, and quite another to assert that the individuals who perform such things do them through the power of Satan.

II. If there are other beings beside God who can perform miracles, it is not probable that they would be allowed to do so, for the following reasons.

1. Man is so made as to expect miracles as proof of divine revelation. Impostors have recognized this as a principle of human nature, and it was by availing themselves of it, that they succeeded in imposing on mankind. The all-wise and gracious Father has so formed us, as to become most easily and certainly the dupes of Satan, provided he has the power and the liberty to work miracles.

This natural relation which we sustain to the miraculous, would seem to be a door constructed on purpose for our Creator to hold intercourse with us; and knowing his character, the most rational supposition seems to be, that he keeps the key of this door in his own power.

If miracles are of so ambiguous a character as the hypothesis under consideration indicates, we should certainly expect that man would be so made as not to be so readily reminded of the Divinity, and so deeply impressed with his presence and authority, whenever he witnesses such phenomena. We can examine wonders. We can doubt whether they are miracles, or the natural production of principles unknown to us. But when the question is decided, and we are convinced that the phenomenon is a miracle of the highest order, is it possible for us then seriously to doubt, whether God is its author or not? If we cannot doubt, as it seems to us to be the case, is it credible that the Deity would so create us that, under certain circumstances, to err would become an unavoidable necessity?—for such would be the fact whenever Satan should perform real miracles.

2. External proofs have been deemed necessary by the Deity himself, in order to authenticate a revelation from him. Is it too much to say that such evidences are indispensable? We do not doubt that when the Deity wishes to reveal himself to any individual, he can cause the person to be fully assured that it is he and no other who speaks. But even to satisfy the person immediately concerned, miracles have been employed, as in the case of Moses and Gideon, when they received their commissions. The great question, however, is,—How can the individual to whom a revelation has been made, convince others that God has spoken to him? He cannot, it seems to us, produce such a conviction by means of internal evidences. For we are not in all cases competent to decide, from the character of the things communicated, whether they have, or have not, been revealed by divine inspiration. For man, before he has been instructed and purified by light from on high, cannot intuitively discern between moral good and evil. Suppose that, under the influence of such light, a man has become a fit judge of right and wrong, the circumstance that the moral precepts inculcated by a pretended prophet, approve themselves to

him, can be no valid proof that the doctrines promulgated are true. The excellency of the moral principles themselves can be no convincing evidence that they have been divinely revealed. For principles which do wholly commend themselves to our minds as soon as announced, may certainly be originally discovered by a mind endowed with superior wisdom. In such a case, also, how can we be assured that excellent moral principles are not designedly employed to give currency to false doctrines? There have been men, very distinguished for talent and learning, who extolled the Christian morals; yet decidedly rejected the system, as a divinely revealed religion. We acknowledge that the argument from the morality of the gospel has great weight. Yet its force is chiefly, if not wholly, felt as a corroborative, rather than primary evidence.

Although beforehand we can form no idea even of the existence of the doctrines, much less can we conceive of their character, yet after they have found a firm footing, they do eminently commend themselves as divine. They have all the vastness, grandeur and proportion which belong exclusively to the works of God. Still this argument cannot be extensively appreciated, till the mind has been for some time under the invigorating influence of a felt belief in the heavenly origin of these doctrines. The great mass of mankind, whose salvation the gospel specially contemplates, can never attain to any impressive perception of such divine attributes of Christianity.

Though the argument from prophecy, in support of the inspiration of the Scriptures, has great force, it can afford no important aid to the divine messenger himself. Prophecy can be produced as an evidence of divine mission, only after its accomplishment. The predictions of Isaiah respecting the captivity, the fall of Babylon, and the advent of the Messiah, could be no proof to his contemporaries that he was inspired. The authority of a divine messenger cannot, by prophecy alone, be firmly established, during his life time. For prophecy, in order to appear really as the effect of divine inspiration, must be a prediction of a remote event, whose immediate causes are not yet in operation. Since by such an evidence a professedly divine revelation could not be confidently received as such, till the age in which it was made had

passed away, and could not be established beyond all doubt in such a character till after several generations, it follows that by such means alone it could not be authenticated at all. For during the interval between its delivery and the time in which men would begin to regard it as sacred, there would be too many opportunities to practise deception. A professed revelation, in order to be truly worthy of confidence, must be visibly invested, at its first entrance into the world, with divine authority.*

Can we conceive of any means whereby a divine revelation can be authenticated, except by miracle? Does it then seem probable that this means, so well adapted to the constitution of the human mind, and, as far as we can perceive, the only possible means by which such an end can be attained, should be allowed to be vitiated, not to say, wholly destroyed? It will not be pretended that whatever mighty intelligences there are, the Deity cannot control them. Does it seem credible that the Most High will permit them to cast their poison into the fountain head of all knowledge? "Surely," says Foster, "it is fair to believe that those who received from heaven superhuman power, received likewise superhuman wisdom. Having rung the great bell of the universe, the sermon to follow must be extraordinary." Not improperly is miracle called the great bell of the universe. It is the instrument which the Deity has ever employed to direct the attention of men to himself. Shall this great bell be rung, and then Satan preach the sermon? For a like reason, miracle has been, with the highest propriety, denominated the great seal of the divine government. Will Satan be permitted to give currency to his doctrines by the use of this seal?

From these considerations we conclude that if there are other beings, besides God, who can perform miracles,

* Mr. Porter denominates prophecy "a kind of miracle." A more unfortunate definition could hardly have been given. It reminds us of Mitchell's definition of a railroad—that it is "a kind of an improved road." It unavoidably creates a suspicion that the author himself did not understand the nature of those things which he professed to explain. Suppose that instead of this subject, we had a text book on the divine attributes, in which the following question should occur. What is foreknowledge? What should we think of the wisdom of him who should reply, "Foreknowledge is a kind of omnipotence"? Yet such precisely is the kind of error that Mr. P. commits.

it is not credible that permission to exercise such power would be granted them.

III. Have we reason to suppose that there are any created beings who are inherently endowed with power to perform real miracles? We will not now insist, that if our conclusion under the preceding head be correct, such endowments would be dangerous, and therefore improbable. We freely admit, that if there are any beings, as we have every reason to believe there are, endowed with faculties vastly superior to our own, it follows as a necessary consequence that they can do things which would appear very amazing to us. As the common acceptance of a miracle is, an extraordinary event wrought by a superhuman agency, the wonderful works of angelic beings might be called miracles. The term is often used in a lower sense even than this. The mighty productions of genius are sometimes said to be miraculous.

Such a definition, it appears to us, is not sufficiently exact. It is very true that miracles are extraordinary phenomena, produced by superhuman power. But so also are all the great natural events which recur at irregular intervals, and whose causes are unknown. The great body of the miracles recorded in the Scriptures are very much more than such language necessarily implies.

Miracles may be divided into two classes. First, those which apparently might be performed by an invisible being, endowed with powers similar in kind to ours, but exceeding them in degree. Secondly, those which require powers exceedingly different, both in kind and degree, from any thing of which we are conscious.

Of those belonging to the first class, but very few instances are recorded in the Bible. The killing of the first-born in Egypt, for instance, might have been achieved by a created being such as we can easily conceive to exist. An unseen agent might, to appearance, cause an axe to swim. We do not say, nor do we believe, that all such miracles as these were not wrought in precisely the same manner as the others. All that we intend to state is, that an agent endowed with invisibility, intelligence and physical power, might produce such phenomena.

We do not remember an instance of a divine messenger, at his first appearance, attempting to establish his claim to such a character by miracles of this nature. To the

unreflecting multitude, they might appear as convincing as those of the second class. But minds endowed with much sagacity would deem the evidence of a divine commission to reveal truth, derived from them, far less forcible than that arising from the second class. When it has been already established by miracles of the second class that one is God's envoy, then miracles of the first class may produce nearly as much amazement and confidence as the others. Should an individual now profess himself a prophet of God, and in confirmation of his claim cause the dew to descend on certain portions of a field, while the remainder was dry, we should feel that fraud was possible. But if, on the day before, he actually raised a man to life who had been for some time dead, we should be prepared at once to receive the irregular descent of the dew as a true miracle.

The second class of miracles, are those whose performance evidently require powers different from human, both in kind and degree. This class embraces nearly all the miracles recorded in the Scriptures. The turning of a rod into a serpent, dust into lice, water into wine; removing instantly, and without the intervention of means, bodily defects and diseases; feeding a multitude, so that they leave very much more than there was at the beginning; raising the dead, are examples of this class. If such wisdom and power as we are now imbued with, were increased to infinity, we could do none of these things. They are all evidently performed by one who is clothed with creative power.

To say that such miracles are a violation, or a suspension, of the laws of nature, is a very unsatisfactory account of them. As long as we live in the flesh, we constantly suspend some of the laws of matter. What are experiments in chemistry and natural philosophy, but successful resistance to, or violations of, nature's laws? But are these things miracles? What should we think of such definitions as the following:—Embalming is a suspension of the natural law of decay; climbing a tree, or a precipice, is an infraction of the law of gravitation; the ascent of sap is a violation of hydrodynamics? The known and constant laws of nature do not all run in the same direction and in parallel lines. They cross each other, so to speak, at all possible angles. To say, then,

that a miracle is a suspension, or an infraction of a law of nature, does not distinguish it from other events which we constantly witness. The raising of the dead recorded in the Bible is no more a violation of law, than the bursting of a chrysalis, or the sprouting of a decayed vegetable.

A miracle, in one view, bears a striking resemblance to the general operations of the laws of nature; as the very unusual attitudes of the human body, in order to meet certain emergencies, are in one important respect like its ordinary voluntary motions. All these changes in the body, whether ordinary or extraordinary, are the effect of the presiding intelligence, acting according to his own purpose. So miracles, like the ordinary phenomena of nature, are changes that occur in obedience to the supreme Mind. We recognize precisely the same power operating, in multiplying the wheat sown fifty fold, and in increasing a few loaves so as to feed thousands. In all these things alike, we see nature through all her domains doing homage to the supreme, controlling intelligence. Though to sustain and govern all the material universe is a greater exertion of power than to calm a furious tempest, yet the power in both instances is of the very same kind. We are so made as to feel assured that all the massive worlds on high will do homage to that being whom the winds and the waves obey.

In all the miracles of this class, we plainly recognize the distinctive attributes of the Maker and Sovereign of all. If the perfections which are clearly revealed in the works of creation and providence constitute him to whom they belong God over all; since the miracles in question display the same perfections, their author also is God. If there are any beings beside Jehovah who can perform them, then there are gods beside him.

It is true, we know not with what extraordinary powers creatures above us in the scale of being are endowed. We cannot, therefore, say with certainty, what they can or cannot do. Yet if we are correct in regard to the miracles under consideration, that they exhibit in their author the same perfections as creation and providence, then, we think we can safely say that to perform such miracles is absolutely beyond all created powers. For is it not quite evident, on the very face of the Scriptures, that no created being partakes in any degree of these attributes? Jeho-

vah alone is the Creator and Governor of the universe. He is so, not because of any adventitious circumstance, but because he alone possesses the requisite qualifications. To create and to sustain belong exclusively to him. Without him, not a sparrow falls to the ground.

While in this respect miracles are like all the other phenomena of nature, viz. that they are the effects of a will that possesses a creative energy and universal sovereignty; in other respects they differ widely from the ordinary operations of nature—as the sudden stoppage or reversal of a steam engine differs from its ordinary motion. They are effects aside from common occurrences, attracting attention by their novelty. Their design is to prove that God is interposing, or has interposed; and to this end, they must bear the unmistakable divine signature. Sometimes they are the evidence that God produced in his own behalf, to prove that it was he himself who was speaking. At other times they are the divine autograph, conferring power on an individual to act as his extraordinary envoy. They are always remarkable phenomena, which take place expressly for the purpose of proving that God is there. To this end they invariably bear the legible stamp of the Creator or Sovereign of the world. Sometimes there is a suspension or a reversal of the laws of nature, as in the instance of Christ walking upon the water. At other times, there is neither suspension nor reversal, but the working out of extraordinary results by means of natural laws, so as to demonstrate that the being who demands human obedience controls all the elements, as in the case of most of the Egyptian miracles. At other times, the miraculous phenomena stand in no relation to known laws, but are the immediate effect of creative power; as in the various cures of diseases and bodily defects, and in the feeding of hungry multitudes with a very small quantity of bread. Between the two classes of miracles which we have mentioned, the only difference, so far as there is any, is simply this, that the first do not so clearly and indisputably reveal the attributes peculiar to the Divinity as the second.

IV. There are no instances recorded of miracles performed by any being except God. Here, to avoid an endless discussion, we shall assume the ground that all instances of real miracles known to us are mentioned in

the Bible. Our object at present will be to examine those passages which, as many suppose, speak of real miracles, performed by Satanic influence.

1. The first that deserve notice are the magicians of Egypt. The history relates that they imitated Moses and Aaron in the first three signs which they exhibited. The magicians had for ages previous to this event, enjoyed great reputation for their wisdom and skill. In the time of Joseph, Pharaoh, in his perplexity on account of his dreams, applied to the magicians. After the time of Moses, they flourished in all their glory, we know not how long. Plato and Pythagoras sat at their feet. The remains of their arts continue even to this day. They were not, therefore, a class raised up at that time for the purpose of withstanding Moses. The wonders which they performed at that time were done by their accustomed arts. The very same powers, we may believe, had been possessed by their predecessors, and were afterward enjoyed by their successors. Did they, at the time in question, work real miracles? Or were what they did simply appearances? Moses gives us no clue as to the nature of their arts, or their performances. He does not tell us by what power they acted, whether by their own, or by the power of God, or of Satan.

If they cast down a true rod, and that very rod became an actual serpent, it will be at once conceded that they acted under superhuman authority. Was it by the power of Satan that they wrought this? Let the nature of the miracle be carefully borne in mind—a stick was converted into a serpent. The miracle was a creative act. Has Satan creative power? To us it is utterly incredible, that any being beside Jehovah can create. Some, at least, of those who believe that an actual miracle was performed by the magicians, have felt this objection, and hence have said, that God endowed them, for the present, with miraculous power, in order to give Pharaoh an opportunity to disbelieve Moses. It will not be pretended that the Bible gives any countenance to such an idea. If any have such a conception of the Deity as to believe that he can act thus, let them enjoy their opinion. In the absence of all proof, we dare not admit an hypothesis which ascribes to God what seems to us so unworthy of him. If, on the other hand, no real miracle was performed, there is no

need of supposing that the magicians were clothed with superhuman power. Take which horn of the dilemma you please, you can derive from it no evidence that Satan can work miracles.

That what the magicians performed was nothing but *legerdemain*, in the common acceptation of that term, cannot perhaps be fully admitted. But that there was any superhuman influence in the case, we have in our judgment no reason to believe. Much that has of late been brought to light, respecting the ancient and modern Egyptians and the East Indians, gives great countenance to this view of the case. "Moses," says Hengstenberg, "was furnished with power to perform that which the Egyptian magicians most especially gloried in, and by which they most of all supported their authority."

The incantation of serpents has been native to Egypt, from the most ancient even to the present time. The French scholars in their description, have given the most accordant accounts of it. Even those who entered upon an examination of the subject with most absolute unbelief, have been forced to the conviction that there is something in it,—that the *Psylli* are found in possession of a secret charm, which places them in a condition to bring about the most wonderful consequences. "We confess," it is said, "that we, far removed from easy credulity, have ourselves been witnesses of some things so wonderful, that we cannot consider the art of the serpent tamers as entirely chimerical. Men and women uninjured handle the *cerastes*, and other serpents, whose poison produces immediate death. The art passes from father to son,—a stranger never learns it. Serpents in Egypt often conceal themselves in the houses, and then become very dangerous. When any thing of this kind is suspected, they have recourse to the *Psylli*. The French commander-in-chief wished at a certain time to examine the affair to the bottom. He called for the *Psylli*, and commanded them to produce from the palace a serpent, which, from traces discovered, was supposed to be there. The moist places were especially examined. There the *Psylli* called, by imitating the hissing, sometimes of the male and sometimes of the female serpent. After two hours and a fourth, a serpent truly presented itself. In the religious festivals, the *Psylli* appear entirely naked, with

the neck, arms and other parts of the body coiled around by serpents, which they permit to sting and tear their breast and stomach, and effectually defend themselves against them with a sort of frenzy, pretending to wish to eat them alive. Their sleight of hand is very various. They are able, according to their assertions, to change the Haie,—i. e. the species of serpent which they especially make use of for their tricks,—into a rod, and compel them to feign themselves dead. When they wish to perform this operation, they spit in the throat of the animal, compel it to shut up its mouth, and lay it down upon the ground. Then, as if in order to give a last command, they lay their hand upon its head, and immediately the serpent, stiff and motionless, falls into a kind of torpor. They wake it up when they wish, seizing it by the tail and rolling it roughly between the hands."

"That which is related to us of the condition of modern serpent charmers in the practice of their sleight of hand, is entirely sufficient to give an insight into the condition of the Egyptian magicians who withstood Moses. The state of these last, no less than the first, was certainly that of the highest enthusiasm, and cannot be attributed to a merely deliberate attempt to deceive; although deception, as is shown to be the case with the modern Egyptian *Psylli*, is by no means excluded by enthusiasm, but rather often goes hand in hand with it.

"It deserves to be noticed also that the present condition of the *Psylli* in Egypt, is entirely one of decay. It is torn loose from its natural connection with the soil of the national religion, from which it originally sprung. It exists in a land in which even now modern illumination has variously exerted its influence and hindered its freedom. Accordingly, nothing is more natural than that very much that is artificial should be added to the extatic condition, and that very much charlatanry should creep in. But what now remains of extacy is entirely sufficient to convince us of the intensity of it, as it existed in the time of the glory of the Egyptian religion and priesthood.

"The opinion expressed upon the proceedings of the modern *Psylli*, which we find among observers who are most free from prejudice, guides us in explaining the fact, that the author of the *Pentateuch* does not speak definitely upon the nature and origin of the results produced by

the Egyptian magicians. Were the thing so simple as it is generally considered to be, were it either common jugglery, or something really miraculous, performed by the permission of God through Satanic influence, then the author of the Pentateuch would not, it is presumed, fail to express an opinion upon it. But since the ground on which these things rest, a very dark and difficult one, is hitherto, indeed, but imperfectly explained by the most thorough investigations, it was preferable to remain standing at the outer edge, without going deeper into the nature of these results. As it respects the thing itself, a farther insight into the nature of these consequences avails nothing."

The supposition made by the author just quoted, that the counter signs of the Egyptian magicians might be real miracles, performed by the permission of God through Satanic influence, is not under any circumstances admissible; because it is not conceivable that any creature can, through bare permission, do such things. Then, to suppose that God assisted Satan to do them is wholly gratuitous. For in such a case, why introduce Satan at all? If God could perform the greater without Satanic intervention, could he not perform the less? As the object of the miracles of Moses was to show the greatness of Jehovah, it is not, therefore, reasonable to suppose that God either would do any thing himself, or permit any superior being to do it, whose immediate tendency would be to diminish the effect of what Moses was doing.

These magicians were a numerous class, and their authority was very great. Nearly all the learning then known was confined to their body. They could therefore have things very much in their own way. None would dare to scrutinize too narrowly their proceedings. If their degraded descendants could play such tricks with serpents as to have astonished the *savans* of Napoleon, what might not the wise men of Pharaoh have done? If these arts, in their declining state, presented to the learned French inscrutable mysteries, how could Moses explain these arts as they were in their glory, to the comprehension of the rude Hebrews? What better, then, could he have done than to say as he did, that they performed their wonders by their secret arts?

That their counter signs were of such a character is

evident from the fact that Moses soon carried them out of their sphere. He commenced the contest with them by storming their chief position. He performed that miracle first, which they could most successfully imitate. But in that trial they were clearly worsted. In the second and third, they only imitated on a small scale, plagues that overshadowed the whole land. In the fourth, their secret arts entirely failed them. Had there been at all any miraculous power in the case, their failure now would be unaccountable. The conclusion of the whole matter is, that there is no reason to suppose the wonders of the magicians were any things more than the productions of arts unknown to us.

2. The resurrection of Samuel is said by some to have been a miracle wrought by Satanic influence. Necromancers were well known among the Hebrews. Though the law of Moses did not tolerate them, yet they prevailed, and were in considerable celebrity as far down as the time of Isaiah. Saul, in his distress, applied to one of them who resided at Endor, situated some four or five miles to the north of the place where the king was then encamped.

On the supposition that Samuel was actually raised, it is natural to inquire,—By what power it was done? For it needs no proof that man is not naturally endowed with any such power. How then was it accomplished? Was it by divine or by satanic agency?—for these are the only alternatives.

It could not certainly have been done by the latter. If the angels of the Lord encamp round about them that fear him and deliver them, an individual so devout as Samuel, during his life time, might indeed be annoyed by evil agents; but he could not be under their power, and at their disposal. Much less could they control his perfected spirit, who had gone to unite with the church of the first-born. Can Satan enter the paradise of God, and carry the blessed spirits from thence at his pleasure?

Did the Lord send him back in compliance with the incantations of the necromancer? He had the power to do it. But is it probable that he would perform such a thing? There were known and appointed ways by which men, in peculiar emergencies, might consult the Deity. Saul tried all these, but to no purpose. If God

refused to answer Saul in his own chosen ways, would he answer him in that way which, according to his own law, constituted a capital crime? Will the Lord, without any necessity, violate his own law? If, on previous occasions, he refused to answer Saul, why should he answer him now? Should it be said, that it was to torment the king; it may be replied, that such an end would be unworthy of God. And if this were not the case, the Lord might have accomplished such an object as well by the ordinary methods of answering, as by this criminal one.

If it be said that Satan was permitted to do it, it may be replied, that if Satan did it, there must have been given him something more than bare permission. He must be endowed, for the occasion, with extraordinary power. This would render the morality of the act more objectionable, than if Satan had no hand whatever in it. For in such a case, Jehovah would unite with Satan in order to establish on a firm foundation the credit of necromancy. If, then, Satan had no hand in the event,—for the objections to such an hypothesis are, we think, insuperable,—it is not incumbent on us to explain the phenomenon.

Yet we may be pardoned, if we volunteer to give an opinion. We are, for ourselves, firmly persuaded that Samuel was not raised at all; that no other one was raised; and that the devil had no more to do with it, than he had with the Salem witchcraft. The whole affair, as it seems to us, was neither more nor less than a successful instance of necromancy. The woman had often brought up departed spirits, just as she did on this occasion. She was celebrated for that very thing. Those servants of Saul, who recommended her to him, might have consulted her, perhaps at this very crisis. To carry on such a business as this, the woman must have been a person of extraordinary cunning. Though she might not have known Saul in person, she knew all about him; and being so near his encampment, she was well informed of his circumstances at that time. It is by no means improbable, that she had been informed of the fact that the Lord had refused to answer him; at least she could not have been ignorant of his present excessively desponding state. It is scarcely possible that she should not have

known Samuel; and it could have been no secret that David had been by him anointed king in the room of Saul. Was Pythia, then, ever better prepared to deliver an oracle, than was the woman of Endor on that occasion? As to the statement sometimes made, that the woman herself was terrified at the apparition, and therefore, it is to be supposed that something unexpected by herself took place on this occasion,—it is a sufficient reply that she must have been a most indifferent hand at her trade, if she could not pretend terror.

Then as to the interview between Saul and Samuel, it is not stated that the king saw the prophet. What is said is incongruous with such an idea. The woman said that she saw him ascending out of the ground. Then Samuel complained that Saul had disturbed him. The idea presented is that the prophet had been in a state of repose or sleep in the interior of the earth. This was in perfect keeping with the popular belief then prevalent; but had no foundation in truth. The sum of the whole matter is this—The mistress of divination pretended to have brought up Samuel; then personifying him, she carried on conversation with the king. She is called in the Septuagint, a ventriloquist. Necromancers were probably always ventriloquists. It would seem that such art must have been necessary to produce the deception. Isaiah says that they imitated the tiny voices of the shades. The historian, whoever he was—perhaps one of Saul's courtiers,—narrated the circumstances as he understood them. It may be that he, no more than the Puritans, knew that necromancy was a mere deception.

3. Our Saviour predicted the advent of false Messiahs and false prophets, who should show signs and wonders; Mat. 24: 24. The older English commentators generally supposed that the signs and wonders here foretold were actual miracles, performed by demoniacal agency. All the moderns of any note, on the contrary, believe that what is here predicted were nothing more than various sleights of pretended magic, produced by optical illusion, simulated cures, founded in artful collusion.

Josephus records various instances of the fulfilment of this prophecy. He mentions no miracles as having been actually performed by these impostors, either in reality or in appearance. They simply promised to show signs.

Hence some have translated *δοσουσιν* by "They will give out, or they will promise." This, however, is not very conclusive; for the same word and its corresponding Hebrew term are used in the sense of, to perform. Simon, the magician, may be considered as a fair specimen of what is here foretold. He performed, it would seem, many wonderful things, and deceived the Samaritan people. But as soon as they had an opportunity to witness real miracles, Simon lost his influence. If he could perform actual miracles by the power of Satan, there would have been no inducement for him to offer money for the gift of the Holy Spirit. He and others foretold by Christ had probably some skill in such tricks as were practised of old by the Egyptian magicians.

4. Paul, in foretelling the great apostacy, says,— "Whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness." 2 Thess. 2: 9, 10. It is here said, that the introduction of the great apostacy will be powerfully aided by Satan. The kind, manner, and degree of this influence are not defined. The fact only is asserted. Elsewhere the same apostle says, that the arch-apostate exerts a baleful influence on the intellectual and moral natures of man, darkening and degrading the whole. We feel no disposition to deny that Satan may have some part, which we cannot define, in the miracles here predicted. If, indeed, it be true that he corrupts mankind, there can be no good reason to doubt his participation in these wonders; since they contribute so largely to the accomplishment of his ends. There is no ground, however, to believe, that Satan either clothes his agents with superhuman power, or in obedience to their wishes performs wonders. We do not profess to be deeply read in monkish miracles. But as far as our knowledge of them extends, we have discovered nothing beyond the capacity of human nature. We do not say, nor do we believe, that all the miracles are a mere sham. We are willing to admit that some instances of actual cure have occurred. But there is no necessity of supposing a superhuman agency. The effect of imposing ceremonies, and of a wild and highly wrought imagination, will most satisfactorily account for them. Generally, in these miracles we discover nothing but the littleness, and the

moral degradation of man. Whatever coöperation of Satan may have been enjoyed, the effect of it invariably has been to lower the whole tone of the mind.

The construction of the passage under consideration is not so intelligible as it might be. *ψευδους* is rightly treated by our translators as a genitive of quality. But they have improperly confined it to the noun immediately before. It qualifies equally all the three nouns in the Dative case. The passage may be rendered thus—"Whose manifestation will be according to the energetic working of Satan (i. e. profoundly subtle in policy, and awfully pernicious, like the influence of the Evil One,) with all pretended power and signs and wonders, and with all manner of unrighteous deception." Thus construed, the passage gives no countenance whatever to the hypothesis, that Satan can work miracles. If these were wrought by his assistance, as we are not disposed to deny, what then? They are all expressly said to be counterfeit, or a deception. That by such means the lawless one should be enabled to impose on multitudes to their destruction, history furnishes the most sad and abundant evidence.

5. "And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire to come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast." Rev. 13: 13, 14.

The Revelator does not profess to give his own opinion of these miracles. He does not state whether they were realities, or mere appearances. The Bible very often speaks both of men and events as they appear, and not according to their true character. All countries and all ages, down to our own time, have been full of pretenders to miraculous gifts. There have been many who, through secret arts, sleight of hand, and ventriloquism, have exhibited the most astonishing feats. But are the wonders performed by jugglers and magicians true miracles? What if we cannot explain how they make fire come down from the sky? Does it follow that the feat is accomplished by Satanic influence? Is it sound reasoning to say, that because magicians, ventriloquists and jugglers can astonish and confound the uninitiated, therefore, Satan can perform real miracles? See Stuart in loc.

Our task is accomplished. The result is this—There are true and false miracles. They are to be distinguished from each other in the same manner as all realities are to be distinguished from mere appearances. All true miracles are the undoubted divine signature, which no power in the universe can counterfeit.

D. W. P.

ARTICLE VIII.

ELEMENTS OF MINISTERIAL USEFULNESS; *as illustrated in the life and labors of the late Jonathan Going, D. D.*

There is no topic more deserving of the study of Christians generally, and especially of ministers, than the requisites of ministerial usefulness. In the investigation of such a subject, the advantages of the concrete over the abstract for most minds, are many and obvious. We are not endowed with such pure and vigorous intellection, as to be able readily to separate and properly embody, even in conception, the mental and moral elements of excellence, so as to have them exert on others, or even on our own minds, the utmost amount of influence. For this purpose they require to be presented in an embodied state, and their capacities for good developed, just as we find them in the lives and labors of Christ's most useful public servants. This indeed may be the very process of God's demonstrative philosophy,—a philosophy teaching by experimental illustrations.

There is, too, a charm in real excellence, presented in the life, the action, the success of its career, which moves, and wins and melts its way into the heart. True, indeed, we are liable to some injury from this same source. We are not a little inclined, first to extenuate, then to tolerate, and in the end to copy the faults, which mingle more or less with such examples as come to our notice, commended by many excellencies. Against this it is our

duty to guard. This is the drawback, perhaps the only considerable drawback, on this kind of instruction. Hence all such models need to be studied with due discrimination.

Excellencies embodied in the life, require to be considered *relatively*; that is, their adaptation to the times and circumstances of their development must be carefully kept in mind. This is emphatically true in the case of Dr. Goings. For though he has but just departed from the midst of us, and not in old age, still the circumstances and position of the Baptist churches have so essentially and greatly changed within the last thirty-five or forty years, that any one who remains ignorant of the situation of the churches and the ministry near the commencement of this century, will necessarily have a very poor idea of the adaptedness of certain traits and qualities to a condition so unlike the present. What, then, were some of the marked peculiarities of that period, as distinguished from our own?

They were such as naturally and almost necessarily, as human nature is constituted, grew out of the unpropitious relations of the Baptists to an overshadowing, bigoted, persecuting, dominant religious party; allied to the State, and having by that union engendered in their very frame-work much corrupting perversion, which marred and eclipsed, but had by no means annihilated their high moral and religious excellencies. Now the direct and almost inevitable tendency of such a state of things was to undue alienation between "the standing order" and the Baptists. The former regarded the latter as intruders, trenching upon their prescriptive rights, whose very successes were odious, as savoring of usurpation. This infelicity of position no doubt accounts for much of the haughty and unlovely bearing which they evinced. They were also the injurers and persecutors, and as such should be charged with having taken the first steps in producing the breach; but the injured party, with the common infirmity which attaches to poor, erring human nature, seemed to take it for granted, that the farther they receded from every thing adopted and practised by their injurers, the more clearly and decidedly would they show detestation and abhorrence of their wrong doing.

The other "dissenting"* sects had in their common tie of Pædobaptism a strong identifying cement, to hold them to the standing order. Even the Friends, while repudiating this and all visible ordinances, held on to a species of birth-right membership, much more assimilated to the Jewish notion—the boasting of having Abraham for their father, so pointedly condemned in the gospels—than to the distinction of being born of God by the Spirit's renovation; and hence, by the way, the corruption and rapid tendency to extinction of this once flourishing and spiritual sect. All the rest besides Baptists had, therefore, a common tie in this common error, which tended to band them together; and from this great aggregation of wrong and evil, our fathers recoiled with a not unnatural resiliency of dread so strong and all pervading, that in the endeavor to escape the contamination of error, they renounced much of the true and the good embodied with it. This was one marked and characteristic feature of Baptist tendencies at the time Dr. Going entered on the stage as a minister of Christ. Jealousy of all extensive ecclesiastical unions, lest they should interfere with the independence of the church, was another; and jealousy of learning, lest it should corrupt the simple faith in God's word, was another.

It indicated no ordinary perspicacity, that from the first, he seems to have discerned the malign influence which this prejudice of his brethren exerted on them directly; and also the indirect injury it produced by increasing the odium against them on the part of their neighbors. With less conscientiousness, Dr. G. would have been powerfully tempted to leave the prejudiced, illiberal, uncandid Baptists, who were so tenaciously determined to adhere to "the right opposite," of whatever their oppressors had practised;—who dreaded, if they did not hate, "the college learned ministers," the written sermons, and the stated stipends or fixed salaries of pastors, which were all esteemed the inseparable adjuncts with that order. But, happily for him and for us, his unswerving adherence to the right and the true of Bible

* This term was allowable, and had an intelligible meaning, while one sect was established by law, or recognized with favors denied to the others. Now it can have no place, and its use in reference to our country should not be tolerated.

principles and practice, would allow him to be nothing but a Baptist.

Again, a man of less firmness would, by adhering to our churches of that day, gradually have imbibed their spirit, and become assimilated to their wrong, but not unnatural, prejudices. Thus is it seen not unfrequently, that a good, easy kind of Mr. Pliable, chooses his place among that denomination which he regards as, on the whole, most conformed to the scriptural standard; and if at first he perceives some things wrong, and dishonorable to their professed subjection to the Saviour, he gradually gets used to these very things. He first apologizes for them, as is very natural; then he defends them, and finally embraces them. Thus did not Going.

Once more, a man of less courage, perseverance and admirable tact, would have felt constrained to abandon in despair the Herculean task of endeavoring to reform such abuses,—to weed out such inveterate prejudices, and bring up the popular judgment and taste to an enlightened appreciation of a worthier standard. It must have been with no small degree of solicitude, that he entered on the work of improvement and reform; especially as he was himself a young man, and of the generally suspected class,—a graduate of the University. But he manfully grappled with all these difficulties, and the labors of his life have left their benign impress on the churches and ministry of his own denomination, while they have also essentially aided to bless our country and the world.*

This general glance at the state of things as they existed when he entered on the stage of official action, may conduce to a more just appreciation of the arduousness, the perplexity and the value of the services identified

* We have not space for any details of the beneficial changes in the above respects, which one third of a century has witnessed. A single summary statement must suffice. At a period just anterior to his settlement in this commonwealth, of the four score Baptist ministers in this State, but fifteen had enjoyed the advantages of a public education. Now there are not less than 115, out of 212, who have enjoyed these advantages at College, or the Theological Seminary, or both. The support furnished to ministers has advanced in an equal ratio. The influence of Dr. G. in securing this change has been immense. As Trustee of Brown University and Amherst College, and of Newton Theological Seminary, of which he was one of the founders, and in all his intercourse with ministers and candidates for the ministry, with churches seeking pastors, or licensing to preach, and with the public at large, he efficiently promoted this advance. The other New England States and New York have been led on by a vigorous and persevering emulation of this noble example of Massachusetts.

with his ministry. Let us now look at these labors in two aspects; first, as he appears simply as a persevering, faithful, enterprising pastor; and next, in the wider sphere of more general evangelical benevolent effort.

Of his services in Vermont, his native State,—where for a few years immediately subsequent to his first entrance on the ministry, he was the pastor of a small but flourishing church,—we have no personal knowledge. From the testimony of some of his contemporaries, however, he appears in a good degree to have evinced, even there, the incipient proofs of the same excellencies which distinguished him at a subsequent period, when settled in this State. It was, however, as pastor of the church in Worcester, that his eminence and success were more prominently manifested; and to that scene of his labors our examination in this department of his service may properly be confined.

Dr. Going, in his ordinary ministrations to his own people, was emphatically a good preacher. He fed his people with knowledge and understanding; studiously and with discrimination bringing forth from the inexhaustible treasury of God's word things new and old; keeping back nothing which was profitable to them, but laboring most anxiously to establish them in what the apostle describes as "the present truth"; that is, the truth most required by their present exigencies. He preached not in the pulpit alone, but every where; in the Sabbath School, the Bible Class, the conference and prayer meeting, in his pastoral visits, and in his casual intercourse with all around him. In this last, there was no mortifying and incongruous drawback, which marred the effect and derogated from the influence of what he had uttered from the pulpit. Like most ministers of this class, whose unselfish preference of the welfare of the cause at large to their own reputation, induces them to do all the good in their power, it was undoubtedly true of him that his ordinary discourses at home, to the people of his own charge, were his best performances. The urgencies of his Master's various and engrossing service did not allow him time to bury himself for half a month in his study, to elaborate with consuming anxiety, and repolish with finical fastidiousness every sentence and paragraph of some great sermon or address, for a special occasion,—which might give

a world-wide renown to its author, and feed his vanity, whether or not it ever fed the hungry sheep and lambs of the fold which the Saviour had entrusted to his care. As a natural consequence, some of those who came together on great public occasions, with more of Epicurean relish than of healthful appetite, and especially those whose morbid anticipation had been unduly stimulated by hearing Dr. G.'s high praises, as a really great man,—were wont to feel and express some disappointment on listening to him. But it is doubted whether he ever failed to satisfy the honest, humble demand for appropriate instruction on such occasions, and often his words were clothed with a power and unction not to be forgotten. The impression which would be left on a discriminating observer on such occasions was, that he was so engrossed with desire to serve the Master and the exigencies of his cause, that all idea of catering for, or in any way promoting his own reputation, his mental or other emolument, was cast into utter oblivion.

Very few of the Dr.'s sermons were ever published; nor is there much hope, it is presumed, that he has left behind him such manuscript preparations as will be deemed by his more judicious friends a fair exponent of his achievements. And yet it is known that he wrote much and well; but without such regard to final revision, as would be deemed requisite for submitting his writings to the press. What this and the coming generations know of him as a preacher, must therefore be gleaned from personal reminiscences, or read on the broad page of the history and progress of the cause to whose promotion these efforts were devoted. His style as a writer was plain but not bold, rather lucid than ornate, never or very rarely offending by its violations of good taste, and happily adapted to his varied themes.

Next look at him in the scarcely less necessary sphere of his service, as a good pastor in other relations. His excellent common sense would not have allowed him to depend merely on preaching for insuring the success of the cause with which his heart was filled. He was the advocate and enforcer of order and discipline in the church of Christ. Patient and meek in dealing with offenders, he was at the same time fearlessly faithful; neither himself forgetting, nor allowing those around him

to forget what was sacredly due to the honor of God's house. He could select, and had adequate influence to induce the church to choose proper coadjutors for his associates in office, and he well knew how to combine his endeavors with theirs, so that the best results might flow from their harmonious coöperation.

He did much good too, especially in the early part of his ministry, by discreet pastoral visiting from house to house. Though sorely tried for a large part of the time in his domestic relations, (his excellent companion, the fond mother of his children, having been repeatedly and for long periods insane,) he did not fail to evince that prime requisite in any good pastor—lively, honest, and abiding sympathy with all the families of his flock in their alternations of joy and sorrow, in the successes and the reverses with which they were visited.

He was eminently successful in getting and keeping in train such coadjutors of his pastoral efficiency as were most valuable:—such as a good choir of singers, a well managed Sabbath School, with such adult and juvenile Bible classes as were required,—either taught by himself, or when other labors made that impracticable, by such instructors as he could confide in for capacity and fidelity. Then, too, he looked abroad to all the social interests and intellectual or moral wants of the community in which his lot was cast. He visited the district schools, in every part of the town, with most happy effect on the teachers and pupils, and indirectly on the parents of the children. He assisted to form, and he mainly sustained by his wisdom and energy and his fertile suggestion of varied resources, the Village Lyceum,—making its social discussions, (before stipendiary lectures were so much known and relied on as now,) a means of incalculable good. Before Temperance Societies were organized or thought of, he was lecturer, committee and council all combined, and many an inebriate did he reclaim with noiseless but energetic perseverance, in pouring upon them instruction, remonstrance, and sometimes most solemn rebuke.

The young men and young women of hopeful promise, whom he called forth from obscurity and often from envioning difficulties, guided with wholesome counsel, and encouraged to put forth their best efforts in various spheres of honorable usefulness, were not few; and the

effect of his labors in this department will prove to be of benign, lasting and widely extended efficiency.

Very pleasant, and not perhaps unprofitable, would be the endeavor to follow out some of these rills which he sent forth from their spring-head, and trace their meandering course, as they flow on, blessing all they reach, and augmenting by fresh accessions in their way, till sweeping before them all impediments, they roll on their full and powerful tide of benign influences for the consummation of the world's hope. How many of those already passed into the skies, and of those who still remain in Worcester and elsewhere, cannot but remember with unutterable thankfulness the various services of the pastor of that once despised Baptist church, which his counsel and care, his toils and enterprizes so greatly improved.

This sketch of his pastoral efficiency would be sadly deficient without the mention of one other item. He loved, honored, sought after, and joyously welcomed and improved genuine revivals of religion. In his days, as now, there were not wanting many specious counterfeits of these richest tokens of the divine favor. But because of base metal which often had to be nailed to the counter as spurious and deceptive, or because of some portions of alloy which often mingled with and dimmed the lustre of what was really valuable, he did not spurn away in disgust, or distance from him by suspicious fears, what bore the marks of scriptural revivals. His efforts to honor them, to extend them, to keep them pure from corrupting admixtures, are believed to have been among his most useful services to the cause of Christ. He specially delighted in the solemn and infinitely responsible work of instructing inquirers. To apply the whole surface of the seal of God's precious truth to the molten wax, while it is most ductile and in a state most easily formative, seemed to him so obvious a dictate of reason and Scripture, that he could not but greatly marvel when he saw ministers and others, mistaking conviction for conversion, begin their jubilant exultation at the very point where the moral crisis was scarcely reached. He had great confidence in thorough, practical instruction at such a time, as a means of discriminating between the precious and the vile; which like the fan of the threshing-floor, will expel

the chaff, that the precious grain may be surely gathered into its appropriate garner.

But let us look next at the wider sphere of usefulness to which Divine Providence introduced him. Happy and successful as he was in the bosom of his flock, his heart was large enough to take in the case of others. To the ministers and churches of that great county in the heart of the Commonwealth, where he was now located, his efforts were naturally first directed. He had the happy faculty of leading the minds and drawing the hearts of those around him, without arrogance or dictation on the one hand, or fawning sycophancy on the other; so that he excited neither envy nor disgust.

His position at the centre of the county, naturally pointed him out, even while youthful, and comparatively unknown, as the man on whom the chief labor and care of the ministers' meeting, the associational interests and the various plans and organizations for doing good which he set in motion, must in the first instance devolve. He met these various requisitions, and called into counsel and coöperation with himself one after another all the ministers and many other brethren of intelligence and efficiency around him. Their improvement—and doubtless his own too, in a degree—was thus secured: but above all, as they learned by close contact his unselfish and true-hearted desire for their mutual good,—as they witnessed his sagacity, which never degenerated into cunning, his free familiarity unmarred by irreverent trifling, his engrossing and paramount desire to honor God and bless the souls of men, they spontaneously and gladly yielded to him the preëminence which he neither claimed nor desired.

His success in his own local sphere, led by natural and easy steps to more enlarged enterprises. The formation of the Baptist State Convention of Massachusetts, in 1824, was through his agency; and after gaining over by its influence, the combined interest and strength of this Commonwealth, to the more general devotement of evangelical effort, he could not and did not stop till a similar organization was effected for the whole country. For this purpose, his brethren of his own State deputed him to explore the wide field of destitution in our country; having accomplished this, and submitted to them the re-

sult, their consent and approval encouraged him to lead on the way for consummating the second grand combination of American Baptists, their Home Mission Society. In all the preliminary measures, and in its final organization in New York in April, 1832, his instrumentality was at every step paramount. The four years which he laboriously devoted to its interests, as its first Corresponding Secretary, were an era in his life and in the history of the denomination. The wise, and far reaching plan of operations adopted at the outset, embraced these three points.—1. To obtain and disseminate information respecting the moral condition of all parts of the country. 2. To excite the entire Baptist community to systematic, liberal and vigorous action, to meliorate that condition and advance the spiritual prosperity. 3. To secure this by the preaching of the gospel to every creature in our country.

The closing paragraph of the address sent forth, with the account of the formation of this Society, to all the Baptist churches in the United States, will clearly indicate the comprehensive and wise design of its founders, to promote all the laudable objects of evangelical benevolence.

“We trust that the indirect fruits of a zealous pursuit of this great object may prove many and priceless. To bring into the labors of love which our Foreign Missions present, the prayers, the wealth, the influence and the hearts of our western brethren; to superadd to the ties of a common discipline, the more lasting union of common sentiments and harmonious feeling; to substitute, for an external uniformity of practice in Christian ordinances, the internal ‘unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace;’ to advance Christian truth and Christian holiness, by seeking the favor of that ‘God who is not the author of confusion, but of peace in all the churches of the saints;’ to inherit the promise, which assures those who ‘devise liberal things’ that ‘by liberal things they shall stand;’ to bring our own beloved country more under the dominion of Him, who alone can give wisdom to her counsels, create ‘upon all her glory a defence,’ and impart safety and durability to her prosperity, are objects of no mean moment. Let us seek for all these, in promoting the objects of the American Baptist Home Mission Society. Let the Christian into whose hands this sheet shall fall, give his aid to this good design, not more by pecuniary contributions, than by the formation of auxiliary societies, the communication of intelligence, and the interchange of sentiment; and, above all, by the communion of devout and fervent prayer to the Father of Lights, the Prince of Peace, and the Spirit of Truth, that the light of salvation may, by means of this society, over the whole breadth of our land, ‘go forth as a lamp that burneth,’ that the peace of God

may unite and bless all our churches and the whole American Israel, and that the Word of Truth may be made each day, more and more, the means of sanctification to all the elect of God."

Dr. Going was now located in the great commercial metropolis of our country, at a period when the condition of our churches there was far less eligible than it has since become. His enlarged, intelligent views, and his cordial, untiring efforts, found ample scope in devising and assisting to accomplish the requisite measures for their improvement. He seems to have early appreciated the importance of establishing there a good religious paper, to be sent forth all over the land. And if truth requires the admission, that in his endeavors to promote an object so desirable,—without adequate experience in such details, without the requisite capital, or ready and efficient helpers,—he thereby drew on himself some embarrassment, and less perfectly succeeded than he wished and hoped, it certainly should excite no wonder.

At this period, and even earlier, his efforts in behalf of our denominational coöperation with the American Tract Society, in diffusing more widely in our own and other lands a healthful Christian literature, and his successful endeavors to secure a Baptist edition of the Comprehensive Commentary, and by its wide diffusion, not only purify the minds and hearts of much error and superstition, but also incidentally furnish a small pecuniary profit from each sett of volumes sold, to the treasury of the Home Mission Society, will remain a lasting monument of his wisdom.

He had now reached the last transition point in his eventful and useful life. His services in the Home Mission, and his repeated and extensive tours in the mighty west, had fully convinced him of the indispensableness of early and adequate endeavors to educate the ministry of the west in their own domains. His eloquent and able advocacy of their claims to present aid in furtherance of this object, naturally pointed him out to them as the most fit instrument to be claimed by them for its successful execution. Accordingly, the colleges at Alton in Illinois, and at Granville, Ohio, simultaneously elected him, each to its Presidency. His conviction of duty, under the existing circumstances, constrained him to visit both ;

and, as the writer of this article had occasion to know at the time, his mind was mainly solicitous to fix on the most destitute and needy; for willingly did he proffer to a brother deemed qualified to share these toils and trials along with him, the choice of the two, with the resolute purpose to occupy the forlorn breach himself.

After full investigation, it seemed to him, and perhaps to others then, that the exigencies of Granville College were the most pressing, and to their urgent solicitation he yielded himself. Rather too late in life for his own comfort, (a point which he very rarely consulted,) he made this great transition. But with his ample stores of varied experience and respectable learning, he was not too late for the advantage of the College, more especially for that of the theological classes, and most especially for the welfare of the Baptist churches and ministers throughout the State. A careful and generous observer can scarcely fail to notice with delight the cheering advance of the Baptist cause in that great State within the last ten or twelve years. Allowing all due praise to other favoring instrumentalities, it is impossible to doubt that a principal share is fairly traceable to his plans while Secretary of the Home Mission Society, and still more largely to his counsel, his aid, his spirit after he became a resident within it.

His modest but free recapitulation of his efforts, in particular instances, to disabuse the minds of some good, but prejudiced and misjudging brethren, as rehearsed by himself in the very last interview enjoyed with him, are still fresh and indelible on the tablet of memory. They occurred in a morning ride we took together, from his residence to the national road. I had just seen him, for the first and last time, presiding with dignity and efficiency in the College halls; had listened to his words of wisdom and kindness in the recitation and lecture room; had sat with him, and knelt with him in that private study, where he was wont to toil and weep and rejoice; had mingled with the inmates of his afflicted family circle, from whom the last adieus had scarcely died away upon the ear. Wending my own way homeward, to enter on the discharge of duties not unlike those which at an earlier period had occupied him in New York, it was to me a more than usual privilege, thus freely to commune

with him on the great and good things already achieved, and the still greater number remaining to be accomplished, with the best and most speedy means of securing them. Thus filled up, those hours sped all too rapidly away; we reached the great thoroughfare, fondly lingered for a few moments to drink in the last lessons of friendly counsel from his lips, and then the stage bore me from his sight.* * * * *

Less than two years had elapsed, ere official duty again hurried me over the same road, and I knew that this beloved and venerated brother was lying down by the side of the grave, not expecting recovery; yet such was the pressure of public requisition on me, that it was impracticable to turn aside for a single day, to weep, and pray, and rejoice with him. Long before my journey was completed, he had gone up on high, to meet the welcome and the "well done" of Him, whom most devotedly and unsparingly he loved and served.

Eminently may it be said, he was taken away from the evil to come,—before the violent and painful sundering of those great and before united operations of our religious benevolence had been consummated. Other hands were lifted up to divide the living child. Its true parents would not have done the deed; and could their counsels have availed, we should not at this hour have presented the spectacle of the

"Membra disjecta cruentaque,"

so vividly portrayed by the Latin poet. Thou loving, forbearing, patient hearted brother! thine eyes were spared this spectacle.*

It only remains to eliminate from this brief sketch some of the elements of Dr. Going's usefulness.

None who knew him would fail to assign the first place to his genuine piety. It was in him no narrow or super-

* The writer of this article has no purpose to attempt awarding the discriminate modicum of censure to which any party or individual may be justly entitled in this matter. Nor would he let fly poisoned or barbed arrows behind him, to rankle in any bosom. What has been done cannot now be retraced; and with humble hope and prayer, that even this schism may be overruled for ultimate benefit, by HIM whose prerogative it is to bring good out of evil; and especially that the more violent spirits on either side may the sooner cease from unholy strife, now that one of its occasions is removed, he will patiently wait the farther developments of this great drama.

ficial exercise, but embraced love to God in all his character, as well as all his truth, and all his cause.

Next to this should probably be placed noble disinterestedness,—uniformly evinced in subjecting self to the paramount claims of duty, and yielding himself to that duty, no matter at what extent of personal sacrifice. He was just such an one as Paul's heart would have leaped to embrace, when in almost utter abandonment, he cried out, "I have no man like minded—for all seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's."

With this should be joined his unvaunted humility,—delighting to honor others,—uncaring for personal distinction himself.

Intimately allied to this last trait, was his generous respect for, and confidence in his brethren, and all good men. Hence this wise, broad-reaching eclecticism, which loved to gather out and combine the good, the true, the useful, from every quarter.

Another element was his wonderful fertility of resources, without recklessly resorting to doubtful and pernicious expedients.

He had also a quick, far seeing eye, a steady hand, fearless intrepidity and faithfulness, coupled with the tenderest commiseration.

To all the rest, it may be added, that he happily combined the spirit of true perseverance, divested of obstinate pertinacity, with a heart that could only exult in what God required and approved; and you have before you the outlines of the man. Take him all in all, not soon "you'll look upon his like again."

R. B.

ARTICLE IX.

LITERARY NOTICES.

1. A HISTORY OF GERMAN ANABAPTISM, gathered mostly from German Writers living in the Age of the Lutheran Reformation, and embracing a full view of the Peasants' Wars, the Celestial Prophets, and other fanatics of that day, and of the Historical Connection between the present Baptists and the Anabaptists. By PARSONS COOKE. Boston. B. Perkins & Co. 1846. pp. 412. 18mo.

One of the external peculiarities of this book which strikes an accurate reader at first sight, is the immense number of typographical errors which deform its pages. To atone for them we find at the end a table of *Corrigenda*, containing *five* corrections; but a still larger number than this can be found sometimes on a single page, as on p. 36. The title-page seems to lay claim to special credibility, being drawn from contemporary historians; but it is questionable whether contemporary historians, viewing events from a near position, are not less qualified to give a fair statement, in some instances, than those who stand at a little distance, who are able to form an unprejudiced judgment, and who are at liberty to compare various and conflicting accounts, and to eliminate from them the exact truth. We are unable to express a full judgment on the merits of the book. Perhaps they are various, some parts having more to be praised, others less. One is desirous of comparing Mr. Cooke throughout with his authorities, and of estimating the value of the authorities themselves, before expressing a decided opinion of his book. The spirit, feelings and object of an author sometimes influence him very much in the use he makes of his authorities; and, in some cases, occasional remarks in the body of the book disclose these matters more exactly than the announcements contained in the preface or introduction. We think the efforts of Mr. Cooke to establish a connection between the Baptist denomination and the Anabaptists, as well as some other things which might be referred to, are of this suggestive character. If the Anabaptists chanced to hold some point of doctrine or practice in common with the Baptists, it does not necessarily follow that the latter sprung from the former, or have any sort of historical connection with them. We do expressly disclaim such connection. Mr. Cooke says, "the sect of Anabaptists took its birth in 1521." We trace the birth of the Baptists to the example of our Lord and Master, and the practice of his apostles. "The fathers of the Anabaptists were Nicolas Stork, Mark Thomas, Martin Cellary, and last but not least, Thomas Muncer." The fathers of the Baptists were the founder of the Christian church, and his immediate disciples and followers. The Anabaptists were from the beginning, to a certain extent at least, a political party, denying the right of civil government. The Baptists were never a political party, and have always maintained the authority

of the magistrates. The Anabaptists rejected the doctrine of original sin, and adopted the errors of Pelagius and Socinus. The Baptists are not Socinians; they are not Pelagians. True Baptists have never been either. Men, adopting these errors, may have coupled with them correct views of the ordinance of baptism; but that alone does not entitle them to be acknowledged as Baptists; much less does it make it necessary for us to trace our paternity to them. The Anabaptists, says Mr. Cooke, were "hordes of banditti," and from them the Baptists "trace their pedigree." But as we have affirmed above, we do not trace our pedigree to the Anabaptists; most certainly, we do not confess to the sin of having had our birth among "hordes of banditti." There are facts in existence which will prove that the Anabaptists were not, in any proper sense of the term, Baptists.

We dislike the manner in which Mr. Cooke seems resolved to force this connection upon us. In various ways, he contrives to exhibit the two sects in such proximity, as almost to compel a stranger to believe us, not only the successors of the Anabaptists, but as partaking also of their errors and sins. He affirms that the first opposition to infant baptism arose out of the denial of the doctrine of original sin; and adds, that "there is evidently a natural affinity between the two doctrines;" and that "there are facts which shew a connection of cause and effect between this rejection, and the adoption of Pelagian, fanatical and disorganizing views." This ungenerous insinuation speaks for itself. The community are witnesses that the Baptists are not given to "Pelagian, fanatical or disorganizing views." He closes the volume by another implication as unjust as it is ungenerous. He says, "The mind naturally refers to a different state of society touching the interests of religion in Massachusetts and Rhode Island. Here were two colonies settled side by side, near the same time, by men from the same stock; the one under Baptist, and the other under Pædobaptist auspices. And the difference in the moral and religious state of the two is manifest to all. Whence has it come?" So he concludes his history. But how sad a begging of the question, in various respects, is involved in such a suggestion! If the "state of society touching the interest of religion" in Rhode Island is greatly inferior to that in Massachusetts, is it demonstrated or demonstrable that the difference is chargeable to the influence of the Baptists—of the Baptists, commonly so called? Far from a generous mind be so unworthy a thought! Far from a cultivated, discriminating intellect, and a noble soul be so prejudiced and narrow a conclusion! It is because the writer of this book is capable of such things as we have pointed out—and they stand not alone—that we said, "One is desirous of comparing Mr. Cooke throughout with his authorities, and of estimating the value of the authorities themselves, before expressing a decided opinion of his book."

With his gratuitous insinuations against the Baptists, Mr. Cooke also manages to insert in his "History of Anabaptism" a series of statements favoring infant baptism, as he affirms, drawn from ecclesiastical history. Their value may be inferred from what we have already seen. Evidently they cannot be allowed on the strength of the author's *ipse dixit*. A good and trustworthy history of the Anabaptists is yet a desideratum. A fair and candid writer, we are convinced, would give us a history in some respects very different from this.

2. *The Great Commandment.* By the Author of "The Listener," etc. New York. M. W. Dodd. 1847. pp. 250. 18mo.

We have perused with great pleasure this delightful little book. It is a gem in our current religious literature. The strain of thorough and evangelical piety, the apt use of the Scriptures, and the earnest applicatory method of the writer carry the reader along from page to page, always gratified, affected and profited, and never wearied. Love to God is enforced on the ground of the love of God, manifested in creation, providence and redemption. The book is full of the "faith that was once delivered unto the saints"; but at the same time, it contains little that is trite or common-place.

3. *Loring's Massachusetts Register, or Record Book of Valuable Information for the year 1847.* Designed as a suitable Companion for the Professional Man, the Merchant, the Public Officer and the Private Citizen. Boston. James Loring. 268 pp. 16mo.

This well arranged and neat hand-book of useful statistics is worthy of general circulation throughout the State. There has been an annual issue of the Register for fourscore years. It is less scientific than the American Almanac, but abounds in valuable information, and is of great importance as a reference book for persons in all the walks of life. It embraces a catalogue of the towns, with their population and number of representatives, the Courts, the civil officers, a historical list of the governors, the present legislature, the first provincial Congress, the postmasters, physicians, and ministers throughout the State, literary institutions, benevolent and other societies, banks and insurance companies, military catalogue, foreign ministers and consuls, tariff of 1846, Royal family of England, Cabinet, Queen's Household, etc., with a great variety of other useful and important information.

4. *Christian Consolations. Sermons designed to furnish Comfort and Strength to the Afflicted.* By A. P. PEABODY. Boston. Crosby & Nichols. 1847. 312 pp. 18mo.

We have read most of these Sermons with sincere gratification. Though they do not present the strong and rich views embraced in an evangelical faith, nor enter into the sublime depths of Christian doctrine, we cannot but admire them, so far as they go. They suggest a multitude of considerations full of comfort to the afflicted, and cannot fail to be read with pleasure.

5. *Payson's Complete Works in three vols.* Portland. Hyde, Lord & Duren. 1847.

These large and beautiful volumes contain the Memoir of Dr. Payson and all his works which have already appeared before the public, together with a very considerable quantity of new matter. The judgment of the public has already assigned a high place to this eminent man, and we rejoice to see his remains in so appropriate a form. We are happy also to learn that a new edition of the works is called for, and will be issued the present summer. It is our intention to revert to these works at a future time.